BAP
M122u
copy 1

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. .....

SCC
8068

Waldron J. Cheyney.
Oct. 25. 1852

THE

UNITARIAN BAPTIST

OF THE ROBINSON SCHOOL

EXPOSED;

In papers collateral to a Discussion of Christian Baptism, and its effects upon civil and religious society as shewn in the Scriptures, and in the history of the Church, in opposition to the views of

MR. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL,

As expressed in a seven days' debate with the Author, at Washington Kentucky, October 1824, *and in his spurious publication of that debate, and of a previous one of two days with the Rev.* JOHN WALKER *of Ohio, and in opposition to the views of the celebrated* MR. ROBINSON, *and other Baptist Authors.*

BY W. L. M'CALLA,

Pastor of the Eighth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and Author of a "Discussion of Universalism."

PHILADELPHIA: PRINTED BY JOHN YOUNG.

1826.

PREFACE.

In the autumn of 1819, the author settled in Augusta, Kentucky, as the Pastor of a Presbyterian Church in that poor and obscure, but delightful and healthful village. As soon as he began to lecture on the Gospel according to Matthew, the Baptists in the neighbourhood, who, as yet, appeared friendly, began to predict that he would take little or no notice of the 3d Chapter. It is now confessed with shame, that after a severe internal struggle, he had partially determined to follow this unfaithful course, although he had kept his intention to himself. His resolution was occasioned not by any doubt of the propriety of our views or practice in relation to Baptism, but by a too anxious desire to live in peace, and to shew his affection to Baptist christians to whom he was very tenderly attached. Just before the 3d Chapter came under review, Major Fee, a man of very advanced age, and an elder of the Church, hearing the prophetic rumour which the Baptist friends had set in motion, communicated it to the author, accompanied with a remonstrance against a policy so unmanly and so unministerial. This occasioned him to give our Saviour's baptism a prayerful discussion of a few minutes, qualified with many sincere expressions of love and esteem for Baptist christians. Mr. Vaughn, a Baptist minister settled in the same place, acknowledged openly from the same pulpit, on the next sabbath-day that the Preacher had said nothing which could wound the feelings of him or his bretheren in the least degree. This was exceedingly gratifying to the Preacher's heart; for although he had not an exalted opinion of Mr. Vaughn in any respect, he thought that union in a good cause, if it could be attained, promised far more usefulness than unnecessary and unprofitable dissention. Had Mr. Vaughn's subsequent conduct been consistent with the above candid declaration, the present work would probably never have been imposed upon the public attention. But bad counsel, disappointed ambition, and a mistaken view of the motives of his friend's conduct, induced him soon to assume a very different attitude. There is reason to believe that Mr. Vaughn's opinion of the Author before and after the lecture on the Baptism of John, very much resembled the opinion which the frogs entertained of King Log before and after their acquaintance with him. They first feared and honoured him, because they thought him dangerous; they afterward despised and insulted him, because they found him harm-

less. Being destitute of that generosity which can appreciate disinterested motives, he afterward attributed forbearance to feebleness, and publicly scoffed from the pulpit, at the Author's expressions of tenderness, as an indication of his timidity and the weakness of his cause; assuring the people that he in reply, had no notion of touching the subject delicately like a man treading on glass. He discovered too late that a more tender walk would have been much to his advantage.

After Mr. Vaughn's most mortifying failure in an attack as unprovoked as it was scurrilous and unfeeling, he and his warmest adherents were much refreshed with Mr. Campbell's publication of the debate between him and Mr. Walker, in Mount Pleasant, Ohio, June, 1820. This remarkable man is not satisfied with a friendly investigation of the subject and mode of baptism, but he undertakes to prove that our practice is "*injurious to the well-being of society, religious and political:*" and to the discussion of this question as well as the other, he publishes at the close of his debate, what he himself expressly calls "an *invitation* or *challenge* to *any Pedo-baptist minister.*" It soon appeared that a subscription paper was in circulation for the joint purpose of requesting a visit from Mr. Campbell, and of paying his expenses. On the Author's expressing a willingness to subscribe five dollars himself, if the paper were presented, it soon disappeared; probably from an apprehension that a repetition of Mr. Vaughn's precipitancy might issue in a similar manner. While they were deliberating upon the matter, between two and three years, the rumours which reached Augusta, concerning Mr. Campbell's genius and education, his resistless boldness and overwhelming eloquence, raised the spirits of his friends completely to the war point, and drove the author of this work to (what he hopes may without presumption, be called,) constant and fervent prayer. From the reports of Baptists and Pedobaptists, all parties expected that on Mr. Campbell's appearance, their eyes should behold such a man as they had never seen before, and might never view again. Their fancies were glowing with the image of a man, whose clear and accurate reasoning, whose ready, rapid and inexhaustible elocution, were backed by such a person and port, such a visage and voice, as were altogether unparalleled and irresistible. The courage of his friends so far from faultering, was now wound up beyond the point of composure, to a considerable degree of confidence. They resolved that the Author should either decline a meeting with Mr. Campbell, or fall before him. Major (now Colonel) Morris, a real friend, was despatched to him, to inquire first whether he was willing to meet Mr. Campbell, and on another visit, to inquire whether he would undertake to communicate his willingness in writing. An affirmative answer being given to both these questions, a correspondence was immediately begun, and on the 15th of October a debate commenced, which (omitting the sabbath,) continued until the evening of the 22nd, (not the 21st, as Mr. Campbell's title page declares.)

In the Prospectus of Mr. Campbell's professed Report of the debate, he has promised that "*all* the arguments on *both* sides, shall be *faithfully* and *impartially* DETAILED." Having circulated many thousands of copies throughout the United States, he has publicly triumphed in the effect produced upon the character and cause of his Antagonist. Sufficient time has elapsed to satisfy both parties that this effect is considerable. In proportion to the groundless exultation of his adherents, Pedobaptists suffer mortification and loss. The exultation was on the other side, at the debate, but it has changed hands by means of his printed Report. Whatsoever may be thought or said about the propriety of exposing such a work, among persons at a distance from the field of conflict, it is confidently believed that every Pedobaptist who heard the discussion, and myriads who did not hear it, are conscientiously convinced that to answer Mr. Campbell's book is an important duty, and that it cannot be neglected without betraying the cause of truth. In defending himself and the Church of Christ from the injurious assault of Mr. Campbell, the Author does not seek a contest with other Baptist ministers or churches. With honest and respectful plainness, he can assure them that it is not their wisdom to be indentified with him. If in some instances, they have thought and acted otherwise, they and not the Author, must be answerable for their folly. It will be recollected that the subjects in dispute, are, whether an ordinance which we hold dearer than life. is "a human tradition," and whether it is "injurious to society, religious and political." When our religious principles and our moral characters are unjustly assailed, we are not more willing to plead guilty, if Mr. Campbell were backed by every Baptist on earth, than we are, when our Accuser stands alone. That the better sort of Baptists in Mr. Campbell's neighbourhood, condemn him and his book, appears probable from the combing which he has received from Mr. Greatrake, a preacher of theirs. But that many others at a distance are otherwise-minded, appears probable from Mr. Campbell's answer to his castigator. He there publishes a flattering communication from an aged stranger in the State of New York, and tells us that he "could give others equally as flattering, from many parts of the United States." The extract which he has copied is signed by Timothy Brewster, a Baptist minister, and is in the following words; viz: "I have been in the habit of reading all publications on the doc-"trine of baptism that have come my way for *forty years*. I "have never found a piece that was, in my opinion, so full so "plain, so pertinent, so instructing, so convincing, so unan-"swerable, and *unexceptionable*, as yours against Mr. M'Calla. "And I thought it and felt it my duty to say to you—*Well done* "*good and faithful servant of the church of the Lord's* Anoint-"ed."

Notwithstanding Mr. Greatrake's statement that "the more solid and pious of the Baptist Church" condemn Mr. Campbell's public debates, he admits that they have secured him ex-

tensive "influence among the Baptists," who have abundantly rewarded his false zeal "with their subscriptions and their smiles." In one place he tells him, "It appears that a considerable part of the Baptist church in these western sections of the country have given the reins of dictation into your hands." From one of these deluded followers, a letter was sent to the Editor or Editors of the Columbian Star, a Baptist paper, published in Washington City; remonstrating against a gross slander which that paper had aided in circulating concerning the manner of conducting the debate. The Editor corrects the slander, but inserts a far more slanderous extract from the letter, of which no correction has ever yet come to hand, although evidence of the fact must have been before the Editors long ago in Mr. Campbell's book. Their western correspondent, to whose statement they try to give currency, by assuring the public that he is "a very respectable clergyman in Kentucky," says, that "Mr. Campbell, in a most masterly manner, supported the cause he had espoused." Mr. Campbell's book has informed them what that cause was; it was a declaration that Pedo baptism was injurious to the well-being of civil and religious society. It has also informed them substantially, of the masterly manner in which he defended it. It was by roundly accusing the Pedobaptists not only of innovation, will-worship and corruption, but of deception, superstition, imposition, persecution, and such like *slight offences.* These accusations, no less impious than impotent, form just one half of that cause which the Columbian Star, through their "very respectable clergyman in Kentucky," would have the world to believe was supported "in a *most masterly manner.*" They are found in that zealous production which secured to Mr. Campbell the "*subscriptions*" and the "*smiles*" of western Baptists, and gave him among them, what Mr. Greatrake calls "*the reins of dictation.*" These accusations form an important part of that book, which, if we may believe its author, has been declared by Mr. Brewster, of New York, and other flatterers equally great, in "many parts of the United States," to be "so full, so plain, so pertinent, so instructing, so convincing, so unanswerable, and [even] so UNEXCEPTIONABLE." Be it so then. There are many Baptist preachers in the East and in the West, who wish others to place them along with the amiable Fuller or Gill, while they choose to indentify themselves with Robinson or Campbell. By profession, they are so charitable and antisectarian that they seem to think it quite sinful to mount a polemical charger even in the best of causes, yet they are willing to hold the stirrup while a more daring champion vaults into the saddle. If in the overthrow of their hero, a mingled strife should trample upon the toes of his abettors, let them remember who made this unhallowed attack, and who said that it was conducted in a manner so "*masterly*" and so "*unexceptionable.*" Let who will utter or approve such foul aspersions, it is right that they should be repelled, that innocence should be brought to light, and the ordinances of God defended.

When, under a mask of zeal against infant-baptism, the Unitarian Robinson of England endeavoured to lead the people away to infidelity, the greatest Baptist in the kingdom was among the first to expose the imposture. But the Baptists of America have republished and industriously circulated this infidel production, and where is the Andrew Fuller to lift his voice against it? Even the solitary and unheeded little Mr. Greatrake, who has condemned Robinson's legitimate offspring (as truly as death is the offspring of sin,) has not, it is believed, borne any testimony against the guilty parent. Even his indignant rebuke of heresy and hypocrisy, accompanied with the most wanton and inexcusable calumny, is rather a reproach upon his brethren, who, partly by silence, and partly by express approbation, have become accomplices in his guilt.

If their error cannot be corrected by wisdom and pious zeal, they are likely to be convinced by sore experience. They already find that taking him into their favour, is like receiving worms into the human body; they prey upon the coats of the stomach, instead of its pernicious contents. They would let him bite at the heels of Pedobaptist Editors, Pastors, Missionaries, Churches and Church-courts, until his heart was eased of its venom; but they find that he is not satisfied with this. Wherever he sees any evidence of piety, zeal or usefulness, among the Baptists themselves, he considers them lawful game, especially if his temper is whetted, like Esau's appetite, by disappointment. When he has made an unsuccessful campaign against such papers as the Lexington *Luminary* and the *Pittsburgh Recorder*, he is very apt to make the Baptist *Luminary* and *Star* pay the expences of the war. These he treats with perfect contempt, while he quotes Socinian and Infidel papers as *supporting their cause* in the *most masterly manner*. It is well known that he is not only opposed to the voluntary pecuniary support of the clergy, but even to the very existence of such an order; and this, not only among the Pedobaptists, but among the Baptists themselves, unless they will become as impious as this Clerico-anticlerial Knight errant, and as abject in their servility as his Sancho, Sidney Rigdon, who attended him to Kentucky. The superior virulence which he has shewn to the Baptist Missionaries reminds one of he conduct of Ahasuerus or Cambyses the son and successor of Cyrus, who, after a disgraceful retreat from a foreign war, wreaked his vengence upon his own magistrates and subjects, and even upon his own brother and sister. A war with women was more suitable to the temper and talents of that degenerate monarch, and those who have witnessed Mr. Campbell's brave and repeated assaults upon the character of Mrs. Judson, the Baptist Missionary, can attest the same for him, without putting Mr. Rigdon to the trouble of signing a certificate. If Mr. Campbell would be satisfied, like Sanballat the Horonite, with opposing the building of Pedobaptist churches only, some of his brethren could bear it, but his anger has burned against the Baptist Church in Pomfret, Connecticut, for de-

voting a house to religious purposes, and he has represented himself as guilty of a real sin in aiding to build, by voluntary contribution, a Baptist church, in a village where there was no place of worship. His own affecting account of this mournful immorality is in the following eloquent language; Viz: "I made an "extensive tour through a part of the eastern region, visiting "the cities of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Wash-"ington, and did, to my present shame, by milking both the "sheep and the goats, obtain about 1000 dollars for the building "of a meeting-house in Wellsburgh, a place then destitute of any "house for religious meetings." If Mr. Campbell would confine his spite to the Pedo baptist Conferences and Conventions, Synods and Assemblies, he would be more tolerable; but he prefers sometimes taking an object on which his artillery may have more effect. For this purpose he very unceremoniously attacks the Baptist Conventions of New England, and that noble committee who were instrumental in their formation. These were the worthy Baldwin, Boles, Williams, Going, and Wayland, whose excellence might well excite his spleen, and whose piety and fidelity in the midst of general defection, endear their names to the writer of this work, and to all who prize the essentials of religion above its circumstantials.

The Author is very far from insinuating that Mr. Campbell should not expose, with a proper spirit, the real faults of Ministers and people, even if they do belong to his denomination. Their being in his connexion should be a reason for denouncing their errors more plainly and fully. But it so happens that their errors are all that Mr. Campbell loves about them, and their excellencies are the object of his unrelenting hatred, and ceaseless opposition. That a man who is perpetually talking and preaching, and writing and printing in such a cause, can be actuated by a proper spirit,———that a tree which bears such fruit, can be a good tree, requires more than christian charity to believe. But he has not left us at a loss for his motive. We shall give it in his own words. After the above mentioned snarling condemnation of the Baptist Ministers and Conventions of New England, he tells us what had moved him to publish that and many similar productions for the past year. "My great object," says he, "was to please myself." There is no reason to doubt that this is as faithful an exhibition of his motives, as the little child made of its desires, when instead of praying, "*thy* will be done," it said, "*my* will be done." And it cannot be doubted that Mr. Campbell's declaration is as good a correction of the first question in the Shorter Catechism, as this child's is of the 3rd petition in the Lord's prayer. For wisdom and dignity, Mr. Campbell considers the Westminister Assembly mere children in comparison with himself. They say, "Man's chief end is to glorify God and enjoy him forever." Mr. Campbell says, "My great object was to please myself." Whether he has not here told more of the truth than he is willing, upon second thought, to acknowledge, may be safely submitted to the judgement of pious

Baptists. Is Mr. Campbell's apposition to praying, singing Psalms, and preaching the gospel, even by pious Baptists, calculated to please God or to please himself? Is his opposition to Baptist meeting-houses and congregations, ministers and Theological Seminaries, on account of the good they do, most pleasing to a good or to a bad conscience? And who is most pleased, the Author of Mercies, or the Father of lies, by Mr. Campbell's fretful and persevering hostility to Baptist Missionaries and Missionary Societies, Bible and Benevolent Societies, and every plan and effort which good Baptists can use for promoting the Glory of God and the good of souls? Let the Baptists themselves consider this matter. "I speak as unto wise men, judge ye what I say."

During the six months' correspondence which preceded the debate, the Author made laborious as well as prayerful preparation for an event which he thought very probable. He brought almost as many books along with him as Mr, Campbell had in the debate with Mr. Walker. These he unlocked by easy and accurate references, occupying three closely written sheets of paper, resembling a Lawyer's brief, and compacted by means of a sort of short hand, almost as original as that of the unlettered shop-keeper, who made a circle for a cheese, and put a dot in the centre to denote a grindstone. These materials being all moveable, could be disposed of in any way that the occasion might call for. They admitted of transposition, compression or amplification, as circumstances might require. At the very commencement of the debate, and in several subsequent stages, the Author thought it best to vary from the method prescribed in his notes. This new arrangement, though not agreeable to an inexperienced theorist, is found by experiment to be so effective, that it will be continued in this work. The only exceptions now recollected, are, that Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the N. T. authorities will be put into places to which they more naturally belong.

It cannot be concealed that Mr. Campbell entered the field with far too much confidence in his own powers. There were many things which grevi ously disappointed the high expectations which his vain boastings had excited. He spent much of his time in complaining of the use which the Author made of his little manuscript. In this he called into requisition all his bravery and generalship; for after many defeats he would rally, and return to the onset. When he found that this availed him very little more than butting his head against one of the trees under which the encounter commenced, he appeared like one reaching in every direction after something to say; and after all, was so much at a loss for matter, that he gave a part of some of his half-hours to his Antagonist. When shame or policy made him keep his time to himself, the palpable sterility of his addresses, his tedious repetitions, and his frequent, protracted, and unmeaning digressions, will not soon be forgotten by those who heard them.

None of these things appear in their true colours in his printed report. There he has suppressed much nonsense, introduced much new matter, and endeavoured to give every thing of his own, such a turn as would at least appear to bear upon the subject in hand. As this is an object better worth contending with than his real speeches, the Author is in some measure, under the necessity of making a corresponding alteration in his replies. Besides this, the audience will recollect that the author repeatedly and emphatically informed them that he was obliged, by the want of time, to omit much matter which was in his notes. His notes are also enlarged during his residence in Philadelphia, by examining the Commentary of the great and the good Dr. Gill, the most eminent and othodox of the Baptist Clergy. Perhaps the greatest improvement in his argument may be found in the history of the mode of Baptism, and in the argument on household baptism, on which last, he has been much aided by Trommius' Concordance, lent to him by his friend and neighbour Dr. Wylie; and by the controversial pieces of Taylor, the Editor of Calmet's Dictionary. For this purpose these last were sent for to London, by Mr. Jos. P. Engles, a member of the same Session with the Author, and one to whose assistance he is much indebted in publishing the "Discussion of Universalism," as well as the present work.

Introductory to Mr. Campbell's Report, he has professed to copy our correspondence. Its many typographical errors make it necessary that a new edition should accompany these papers. In one of these letters, the Author mentions a reformed City of Switzerland, as the seat of a theological debate. In the letter now in my hands, the name of the place is BERNE; in Mr. Campbell's printed copy, it is ROME. However, in his view, there is very little difference between the Mother of Harlots and the Bride of Christ: for the sake of their infants, he treats them both pretty much alike. The unusual freedoms which he has taken, not only in composing and publishing for the Author, but in traducing his character, and that of others, would certainly deceive the public, and injure the truth, if they were to pass unnoticed. A narrative of facts, the spuriousness of the report, and some account of the Reporter, will necessarily swell these collateral papers. On the last subject the Author hopes to be excused for republishing several pages of Mr. Greatrake's testimony. These documents will be closed by a new miniature ironical Report, in alternate speeches, intended as a syllabus of the Author's real argument, in connexion with specimens of that portion of Mr. Campbell's book, which cannot be noticed in a serious defence.

After what has occurred in a similar case, it would not be at all surprising, if Mr. Campbell had succeeded in propping his frail fabric, by the premature and *ex parte* testimony of many witnesses. Of this he has had a fine opportunity, from which his Antagonist has been precluded by removing to Philadelphia.

He even tells us of several of his particular friends who took notes during a part of the debate. Yet after all, he has laid before the public no certificate, except that of his mere shadow, Sidney Rigdon, who might as well be called Sidney Sub-Campbell. As many are in the habit of confirming matters by two or three witnesses, he thinks to give double weight to his certificate, by representing its author as a Bishop of Pittsburgh. He neglected however, to inform us that this celebrated Pittsburgh Bishop, Sidney Rigdon, is the creature of Alexander Campbell, Archbishop of Buffaloe Creek. As this expert manufacturer of Episcopal witnesses, knew that several Pedobaptist ministers also took notes, he endeavours before hand to invalidate their testimony, by an artful insinuation that neither of them was present during the whole debate. After naming one who actually did depart, he mentions the other, as "the young divine that took his place, after he quit the ground." Mr. Campbell had skill enough to know the point of danger. He knew that this young divine had a soul of his own; and he knew also that he had taken no man's place, but had, attentively and laboriously and faithfully, kept his own place, from the commencement to the close of the controversy. Now Providenee so directed events, that this young divine came to Philadelphia as a Delegate to the General Assembly of May 1825, a few weeks after the Author had commenced the perusal of Mr. Campbell's book. A certificate which, by request, he wrote at his lodgings, and handed to the Author, may now be seen beside that which Mr. Campbell, has adduced.

Certificate of Mr. Rigdon.

"To all whom it may concern: This is to certify that having been present at the Debate in Kentucky, in October last, between Mess. A. Campbell and W. L. Maccalla, and that being engaged in taking notes of that discussion, which I handed over to A. Campbell, and having read over that discussion on the subject and action of Christian baptism, now presented to the public in the following pages, I can recommend the same as a fair and full exhibition of both sides of the controversy, of the arguments and topics of illustration, used by the aforesaid gentlemen.

SIDNEY RIGDON."

May 4, 1824.

Certificate of Mr. Lowry.

"Philadelphia, May 24th, 1825.

I do hereby certify, that I attended at the debate on Baptism, held at Washington, Ky. in October 1823, between Mess. Campbell and Maccalla; that I was present during the whole discussion, and took notes. I have since read the account of the debate as given by Mr. Campbell, at the same time comparing it with my notes; and can unhesitatingly say that the account given is essentially incorrect, as to the matter and manner, both of Mr. Maccalla's speeches and his own.

Given under my hand this day and date above.

SAML. G. LOWRY."

Let any sober, experienced and practical man,———let any pious and intelligent Baptist, now place himself in the Author's situation. Suppose that a decided enemy to Christianity, calling himself a Regular Pedobaptist Minister, were to arraign the whole Baptist denomination before the public, undertaking in the most confident manner, to prove them guilty of the highest crimes, and to prove their system of religion inconsistent with

the well-being of civil and religious society. Suppose that for years he has sole possession of the Arena, vapouring and vaunting, and strutting and swelling, and puffing and boasting like a swaggering braggadocio, challenging any man of the Baptist ranks to stand in their defence, and casting their quietness into their teeth, as an evidence of their guilt. Suppose that after being fairly met and completely defeated, he should endeavour to retrieve his affairs, by an expedient as directly opposed to common honesty and veracity, as it is inconsistent with every manly and noble sentiment of the soul. Suppose that he forges speeches for you, which are any thing but your own, and which he may answer and confute at his leisure; and thus effect by fraud, what he could not do by force of argument. Would you think it inconsistent with true piety, meekness and charity, to say to this man, as Michael did to this man's father, "The Lord rebuke thee?" Paul called such a man a "child of the devil," and an "enemy of all righteousness;" and so would you. It is true that many would condemn you for doing so, but in the midst of reproach, you could, with a clean conscience, commend yourself and your defence to the blessing of the God of truth. Through grace, this is the present state of the Author's mind. He covets the affection and esteem of pious Baptists: but he cannot purchase their favour, at the expense of tame submission to a heretical pirate, nor of basely deserting the interests of religion. If it be necessary, he is willing to tell the truth without their aid, and even under their displeasure: yet he would rather have their concurrence in opposing a common enemy. Praying that this may be the case, he commends this work to God, and to the candid perusal of God's people

PRELIMINARY PAPERS.

No. 1.

THE CHALLENGE.

Near the close of Mr. Campbell's last speech, according to his own report of his Debate with Mr. Walker, we find the following paragraph; Viz: "I have now accepted the invitation or challenge of the Seceders, and having now fully satisfied their "most eager desires for an interview of this kind, I conceive it "is my time to give an *invitation* or *challenge* to *any Pedo-baptist minister;* and to return the compliment with the utmost ce-"remoniousness, *I this day publish to all present. that I feel disposed to meet any Pedo-baptist minister of any denomination, of good standing in his party, and I engage to prove in a debate with him, either viva voce, or with the pen, that* INFANT "SPRINKLING IS A HUMAN TRADITION AND INJURIOUS TO THE "WELL BEING OF SOCIETY, RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL. I have "to add that I must have an equal vote in determining the time "and place. This is the only restriction I attach to the CHALLENGE *I now publish.*"

About two years after this bold defiance, Mr. Campbell had occasion to answer the Letters of Mr. (now Dr.) Rallston. His strictures commence with the following paragraph; Viz — "Many reports have been in circulation respecting the debate "at Mount Pleasant. Before that debate took place, much was "said concerning the superlative abilities of Mr. Walker. It "was asserted that 'he was one of the brightest ornaments of "the Secession sect.' But alas! such is the caprice of mankind, "such the instability of popular opinion, that it is now agreed "on all hands, that Mr. W is even below mediocrity; and, "what is still worse, it is reported that he came to the stage of "debate, 'totally unprepared.' This is ungrateful and cruel. "That those of his own views, and especially of his own sect, "should thus reward his zeal and efforts in their cause. *Besides*, "*who on his side of the question*, SINCE *or before that Debate*, "*has done better or who* CAN *do better?* For our own part we "sympathize with Mr. Walker, and do not rate his talents nor his "industry so low, as either his quondam or his present friends "seem to do. We think it an act of extreme unkindness, on "the part of his professed friends, to attribute the refutation of "the Pedo baptist arguments to the incapacity or negligence of "Mr. W. *Is there no man in* ALL THE HOSTS OF PEDO-BAP-"TISTS, *of greater capacity and industry than Mr. Walker?* IF "THERE BE, LET THE CAUSE BE MAINTAINED *and let not Mr.* "*W. bear all the blame, as if the whole cause rested on him.*"

When these invitations were at last accepted, and the parties were on the ground, Mr. Campbell had penetration enough to see that there was an advantage in being thought not only bold but modest, He had secured the former character by his challenges, and he endeavoured to secure the latter, at the expense of his Antagonist, by representing his Opponent and not himself as the challenger. Finding all the evidence against this position, he endeavoured to establish it by a circuitous process. He represented this Debate as arising out of his debate with Mr. Walker, in which the challenge came, according to his statement, from the Pedobaptist and not from the Baptist party. This he has publicly declared in the introduction and in the close of his Debate with Mr. Walker. In the first place he says, "As Mr. Walker gave the challenge, it became his duty to open "the debate" In the last place, he says, as recorded above, I "have now accepted the invitation or challenge of the Seceders."

Mr. Campbell's challenges gained him a character for at least ordinary courage, among the Kentuckians, who are no strangers to combats, either in words or blows. But they gave him credit for more than common boldness, when they found him, in the face of palpable evidence, denying the fact of his being the challenger. As such heroic exploits are seldom found alone, his assertion concerning Mr. Walker's sending the original challenge became liable to suspicion. It seems that Mr. Greatrake excited Mr. Campbell's wrath by expressing such a suspicion in his own

neighbourhood. In reply to Mr. Campbell's censures, he afterwards reiterates his opinion in the following language, Viz.— "You go on to observe that in your first debate with Mr. Walker you 'was written to three times,' before you accepted of "the challenge. Who wrote to you? Not Mr. Walker: No, it "was a Baptist minister, Mr. Birch: and who knows but it was "a preconcerted thing between you and Mr. Birch? This is a "conjecture, to be sure, but one, in a measure, authorized by a "knowledge of your 'ruling passion.' It is certain you left the "essential interests of those who were more immediately under "your care, as a teacher, to go elsewhere, to contend for subor-"dinate principles. *And it is certain, and positive, and true, "that you never did receive a challenge from a Pedobaptist, to "debate.*"

Mr. Campbell gave previous printed notice of the debate between him and Mr. Walker. In this he represented his antagonist, as, "*having challenged any minister of the Baptist Church.*" This advertisement Mr. Walker read and exposed about the commencement of their interview. The introduction to Mr. Walker's Reply to Mr. Campbell's report speaks of the affair as follows, Viz. "Mr. Walker then proceeded to read "the advertisement mentioned above, in which it was stated "that 'Mr. Walker having challenged any minister of the Bap-"tist church,' &c. Mr. Walker then publicly denied, that ever "he had challenged any minister of the Baptist church, for a dis-"pute." Mr. Campbell after stating that he was the author of the "publication, said that he had received the information from Mr. "Birch. By request, Mr. Birch then made a full statement of "what had passed at the place, at which Mr. Walker preached." ["The fright in which Mr. Birch appeared, I think did not pre-"vent him from telling the truth, I believe he was candid."] (a) "Mr. Birch gave no hint of such a challenge. A falsehood rest-"ed some place; and although Mr. Walker proved to the satis-"faction of the public, that no such challenge was given, Mr. "Campbell never blushed."

Let Mr. Brewster of New York now contemplate his "good and faithful servant of the church." The Editors of the Columbian Star will at least blush for their champion: but what words could express their indignation and contempt against a Pedobaptist disputant, if his skirts were defiled with such duplicity and turpitude?

(a) A note which Mr. Walker places in the margin, is here inserted in brackets, in the place to which it belongs.

No. 2.

THE CHALLENGE ACCEPTED.

M'Calla to Campbell.

Augusta, Bracken County, Ky. May 17th, 1823.

MR. CAMPBELL———The subject of this communication is your publication on Baptism, and particularly your proclamation to the multitude at the close of your debate at Mount Pleasant. It is found in the last paragraph of the 144th page of your book, entitled, "Infant Sprinkling proved to be a human tradition:" printed in Steubenville, Ohio, 1820. You there say, "I "conceive it is *my* time to give an invitation or challenge to *any Pedobaptist* "*minister* and to return the compliment with the utmost ceremoniousness, I "this day publish to all present that I feel disposed to meet *any Pedobaptist* "*minister of any denomination, of good standing in his party, and I engage to* "*prove, in a debate with him, either viva voce, or with the pen, that Infant Sprink-* "*ling is a human tradition, and injurious to the well being of society, religious* "*and political.* I have to add that I must have an equal vote in determining "the time and place. This is the only restriction I attach to the challenge I "now publish."

Some copies of your book came to this village immediately after its publication. As the topics which it discusses had been matter of controversy amongst us, those who espouse your opinions, set on foot a plan, (as I was informed,) to procure a visit from you, for the purpose of encountering me in public debate. What was the cause of their failure I cannot tell: but rumours of your intending to visit this country, and probably this place, are lately renewed, and I am encouraged by your friends to hope that a letter from me might accelerate such an event. The anxiety which they manifest for our meeting, appears like a call of Providence, for me to solicit your approach, which, in other circumstances, my conscious weakness and natural timidity might cause me to deprecate. If, however, you should gratify our wishes, it is not necessary that you should consider this as a challange, but only as an acceptance of your invitation copied above. Nothing more was needed from me, after the publication of a general challenge by yourself.

Neither is it necessary that you should understand me as professing a willingness to confer with you on the truth or falsehood of the statements in your proclamation; i. e. "that Infant Sprinkling is a human tradition, and injuri-"ous to the well being of society, religious and political." In order to come at the merits of a controversy, there are three things at least to be desired. The first is to lay hold of the most important points in dispute, whether they be principal or auxiliary, doctrinial or historical. A second is, that they be clothed in language, every way suitable; possessing the qualities of purity, propriety and precision. The third is that the question or questions be so stated as to preclude equivocation, if possible, and bring the parties directly to an issue; so that one can affirm and the other deny, or if both agree, one shall be considerably the gainer. In the pursuit of these objects, (as far as circumstances would permit,) I have drafted the following questions which are now respectfully submitted for your consideration, and (if you please) for your adoption or rejection, amendment or selection, enlargement or diminution.

1. Were Abraham and his seed divinely constituted a true church of God?

2. Is the christian church a branch of the Abrahamic church? or, in other words, Are the Jewish society, before Christ, and the Christian society, after Christ, one and the same church in different dispensations?

3. Are Jewish circumcision, before Christ, and Christian Baptism, after Christ, one and the same seal in substance, though in different forms?

4. The administration of this seal to infants; was it once enjoined by Divine authority?

5. Is it now prohibited by the same authority?

6. Do the Jews baptize the infant offspring of proselytes on the profession of the parents?

7. Did they practice this in the time of John the Baptist?

8. Did they learn their proselyte Baptism from the Christian Church?

9. Is John's Baptism Christian Baptism?

10. Are the American Baptists descended from John? or, in other words have they obtained their Baptism from him by uninterrupied succession?

11. Are the American Baptists descendants from the German Anabaptists? or, in other words, have they obtained their Baptism from Munzer?

12. Did John Baptize infants?

13. Did John Baptize by submersion?

14. Does the Bible authorise the Baptism of infants as a Christian ordinance?

15. Has the church of Christ always practised the Baptism of infants as a Christian ordinance?

16. Does the Bible authorise the church to consider submersion essential to Baptism?

17. Has the church of Christ always considered submersion essential to Baptism?

18. Is the administration of the initiatory seal of the church to infants, injurious to the well being of society, religious and political?

19. Is sprinkling, when used as a mode of Baptism, injurious to the well being of society, religious and political?

20. Is the exclusion of infants from the church hurtful to society?

21 Is the exclusive practice of submersion as a mode of Baptism hurtful to society?

To all these questions I can conscientiously answer with a direct affirmative or negative, and you could do the same. From your publication of the debate at Mount-Pleasant, I fairly conclude that, (unless suppressed by mutual consent) they will be discussed if we should ever meet. The most orderly method of discussion will be the most expeditious and edifying. The terms of conference may, I hope, be precisely, if not easily, adjusted, should Providence bring us together. I am admonished by a friend of yours to use no equivocation in assuring you that a meeting is now expected, either according to this letter or some other plan. Evidence of unwillingness on your part will be considered as a withdrawal of your challenge. Having asked advice of God my Redeemer, to him do I now commit this affair.

W. L. MACCALLA.

No. 3.

Mr. Campbell to Mr. M'Calla.

Buffaloe, Brook County, Va. June 16th, 1823.

MR. MACCALLA,

SIR—Your favor of the 17th ult. came to hand two weeks since. Though I was pleased with the style and spirit of your epistle, yet having never before heard of the writer, I thought it necessary to ascertain of what character and standing he might be, before I should make any reply. In the midst of my inquiries on this subject I received a letter from Dr. Keith of your town, informing me of your "high standing," in the Presbyterian denomination, and of your general character. Dr. Keith's account was also confirmed by the testimony of a Mr. Logan from your vicinity and a respectable member of your community, who favored me with a visit. Being now satisfied on the above subject of inquiry, and being convinced that it is my duty to meet you, in public debate, on the subject proposed; I inform you that I most cheerfully consent to meet you as aforesaid.

The *challenge* to which you refer necessarily grew out of the circumstances which accompanied its first promulgation. I was *drawn* into a discussion by a challenge from a Paido-baptist. Having seen *that* Paido-baptist confuted; generosity, candor, and the triumph of truth suggested the propriety of giving an opportunity, to any other Paido-baptist teacher, of coming forward to take Mr. Walker's side of the controversy, if he thought he could make a better of it. His side of the controversy was comprised in one short proposition, viz: "*that infant Baptism or affusion is a Divine institution.*" The side which I assumed, from conviction, was comprised in the negative of this proposition, viz. that "infant Baptism or affusion is *not* a Divine institution," but a human tradition. This. I think I *then* proved. I am ready, however, to do it again on *any* other ground that *may*, or *can* be taken. The simple question to be discussed, divested of every thing extraneous, is this, is infant affusion, or, as it sounds sweeter to a Paido-baptist ear—*Is infant Baptism a Divine institution.* Mr. Walker said *yes*, I said *Nay*, I still say *Nay*. I say it is a human tradition and injurious, &c.

As to the *place*, *time*, and *manner* of proceeding in the proposed discussion I would observe; first, with regard to the *place;* that reason and equity suggest that it should be equidistant from you and me. I have no business to Kentucky more than to any other part of the Union; yet on certain conditions, I am willing to go to Augusta.

With respect to the *time*, I think in ought not to be sooner than two or three months after we have agreed upon the preliminaries: i. e. it should be published in all the circumjacent country for so long a time. And as respects the *manner* of procedure, I would say, I have no objection to take up and discuss all the questions you have proposed, or any other you may please to propose provided that I have the liberty of proposing an equal number. But in order to facilitate and expedite an agreement on the preliminaries, I will take the liberty of suggesting the following, which I conceive to be perfectly reasonable and of course equitable—

1. That W. L. Maccalla agrees to attempt to prove that infant affusion or infant Baptism is a Divine institution, and A. Campbell agrees to attempt to

prove that it is *not*, in a public debate to be held, *if the Lord will*, at Augusta, Kentucky, on Wednesday the first day of October next, to commence at 1 o'clock, A. M.

2. That each of the parties shall choose one person to act as Moderator, and that these two shall choose a third, who is neither a Baptist nor a Paido-baptist, to sit with them.

3. That these Moderators shall merely keep order and not pronounce judgment on the merits of the debate.

4. Each speaker shall speak thirty minutes without interruption, if he wish to speak so long, if not, he is free to stop when he pleases.

5. W. L. Maccalla as he supports the affirmative necessarily opens the debate and A. Campbell closes it.

6. The Scriptural *subject* of Baptism shall first be discussed, then the *action* of Baptism.

7. The debate shall be conducted with decorum, and all improper allusions and passionate language guarded against.

8. Whatever books are produced on the occasion shall be equally accessible to the use of each disputant.

9. The discussion shall be continued from day to day until the people are satisfied, or until the Moderators agree that enough has been said on each topic.

These are *substantially*, and some of them *formally*, the same with those agreed upon by a committee at Mount-Pleasant, previous to that debate. If you agree to these, the preliminaries are settled, and you may immediately publish the place and time of holding said debate, and please inform me per return of mail. I will then furnish you with an equal number of questions to those you have proposed for your consideration, that you may have the fullest time for reflection. You have my consent if you please, to call to your aid any of your Paido-baptist brethren in the ministry. I wish to convince or to be convinced. As truth is my riches, the more I gain of it the richer and the happier I must be. Moreover I shall feel a great obligation to you if you convince me of any error. I hope therefore you will spare no pains in you efforts to convince me. You may rest assured that you will find me open to conviction and anxious to maintain what I believe.

A. CAMPBELL.

No. 4.

M'Calla to Campbell.

Augusta, Kentucky, July 2, 1823.

MR. CAMPBELL———Your letter of June 16th has just been received. It speaks of the time and place, the topics, regulation and notification of the dispute in prospect. You appear willing to see me at Augusta, if I will comply with all the conditions of your letter. As this compliance is declined, the place of meeting is a point still to be determined. If you should yet consent to encounter me here, the meeting of our presbytery and synod in which our congregation has business imperiously demanding my attention, will make it desirable that we should appoint a time a week sooner or several weeks later than October 1st.

The adjusting of the points of difference, in the form of disputable propositions, however difficult, is deemed important by us both. After having intimated to you my objections to the form contained in your challenge, I proposed a number of questions which bring into view all the matter of the question contained in your challange, with these advantages, that its complication is removed by method, and it is presented in such a manner as to to bring the parties to a *fair* and *direct* issue. You do not seem to doubt that these ends have been attained. Yet as a condition of your agreeing to discuss these questions, which you have seen and examined, you require that I should agree on my part, to discuss as many others which I have never seen nor examined; although you have had the same opportunity of conveying them to me, that I had of sending mine to you. "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him." To promise a contest on a subject not yet known, is a sort of theological Quixotism worthy only of the dark ages. If you have been told that I love controversy for its own sake, you have been misinformed. I would not waste my breath nor poison my heart, nor disgrace religion by vain jangling. With the help of God, I am willing to defend the truth as held up to view in the propositions referred to, or in any other equitable form, or if you prefer it, with no form at all. I am willing to meet you with no other words before us than "*The subject and mode of Baptism.*"

Although you have made no particular objection to my questions, I have several to the one which you propose in your epistle: viz. "Is infant affusion, or ....is infant Baptism a Divine institution?" I have the same objections to the proposition discussed by you and Mr. Walker, 'that infant Baptism or affusion is a divine institution.' 1st. These propositions confound the subject and the mode, which are distinct things, and which may be so exhibited in fewer words as in the end of the last paragraph. 2d These propositions encourage a popular misconception, which has been too much insisted upon by our adversaries; that is, that we hold infant Baptism to the exclusion of believer's Baptism; than which nothing is more incorrect. We maintain as strenuously as our opposers, the administration of Baptism to believers; but we differ from them in this proposition, that *faith in the subject is an essential qualification for Baptism;* or which is the same thing, we are willing to prove that *Baptism should be administered to infants* as well as to their believing parents. 3d These propositions confine us within narrower bounds with regard to the mode, tha we in good conscience occupy. We do not advocate a usion exclusively; and if you leave this word out of the propositions, they are confined to the subject and say nothing of the mode. We admit of washing and sprinkling as well as pouring, and we even acknowledge the lawfulness of dipping: but we deny that *submersion is essential to Christian Baptism*, and you affirm that it is. Since then this proposition will bring us directly and fairly to an issue, why should you make it a condition of an interview that we should assume ground worse than that which we in truth occupy.

With respect to your 9th article I would observe that the people will always let us know when they have *heard* enough, but the parties should be permitted to judge when they have *said* enough. In your 5th article you claim the closing address. This you would probably have without any stipulation, for in practice I am not tenacious, but I see no reason for acknowledging your superior right. In the conference at Mount-Pleasant you say that

" as Mr. Walker gave the challenge, it became his duty to open the debate." You of course had the privilege of closing. The above is your own declaration; and the only reason which you give for making it Mr. Walker's duty to open the debate, is that he gave the challenge. Now the case is altered, and your view of duty seems to alter with it. According to the principle and the practice stated in your book, *As Mr. Campbell has given the challenge it becomes his duty to open the debate*, and mine to close: but according to the demand of your letter, you must close whether you give or receive a challenge. Since this is a new practice, your letter gives a new reason for it, that is, that it is the right of the negative to close. But where did you learn this rule? I am as ignorant of its origin as of its correctness. This rule or its opposite would in doctrinal disputes, be arbitrary in its application. The same doctrinal opinion may be exhibited equally well in opposite forms of expression: and whether the proposition be affirmative or negative the same proof would be required on both sides. Of this you will see an example in my two letters. In civil courts and in the courts of our church there is a rule on this subject, but its relates to matters of fact in judicial cases, and not to doctrinal questions. This practice is, however the very opposite of that which your letter approves, for it gives to the affirmative the right of opening and closing. I wish not to take advantage of this. My desire is, that each party may be heard fairly and fully, and until he is satisfied, and if we have not sense enough to quit when we are done, the people will, to our mortification, give their opinion by leaving us.

The inequality of your terms, you now see, is the only impediment to our meeting. This it is hoped you will relinquish, not only for justice sake, but because it is in direct opposition to your challenge. You there say "I have "to add, that I must have an equal vote in determining the time and place. "This is the *only* restriction I attach to the challenge I now publish." There is nothing here of your closing the debate or enjoying any other privilege above your antagonist. If, however, you cannot comply with these fair terms, I have only one other plan to propose. It is this. We will agree to discuss the very proposition which you have offered in your challenge. As this is one in which you take the affirmative, and as both your rules however contradictory and unauthorised, will give me the closing address, though unsought, nothing more remains now to be settled but the time and place, which are the only subjects on which you claim a vote. If you should visit this place, I would endeavour to make all other engagements suit your convenience. If you should prefer some other place where I could procure books, or to which I could with cheapness and convenience convey my own, such as Pittsburgh, Wheeling, Steubenville, Washington in Pennsylvania, or Washington City, Baltimore or Philadelphia, New-Haven or Boston, I should like for the time to be shortly before or after the General Assembly, which convenes in Philadelphia on the third Thursday in May, and sits about two or three weeks. When the preliminaries are adjusted, all possible publicity may be given to the appointment according to your request. If it be your choice you can send a notice to the papers of Philadelphia and elsewhere, that "on the third "Monday of May, 1824, Mr. Alexander Campbell of the regular Baptist "church, and Mr. W. L. Maccalla of the Presbyterian church, will, (*Deo "volente*) discuss the following proposition, viz. '*Infant sprinkling is a human*

"*tradition and injurious to the well being of society, religious and political.*' "For the discussion of this proposition the former of these gentlemen gave a "general challenge to Pedobaptist ministers."

As you have offered a system of rules for the debate, it may not be wrong for me to do the same. It need have no effect upon the question whether we shall meet. They are not made conditions. Words in brackets are considered as so many blanks.

Rules of debate adopted and signed this [16th day of May, 1824, in the city of Philadelphia] by Alexander Campbell, and W. L. Maccalla. Duplicates given to the parties.

1. The proposition for discussion shall be the following, viz. ["Infant sprinkling is a human tradition, and injurious to the well being of society, religious and political."]

2. Each speaker shall be entitled to an alternate address of thirty minutes and no longer, unless the other party waive his right.

3. The books brought forward shall be equally accessible to both parties.

4. The established rules of decorum must be observed.

5. The discussion shall be moderated by three men; each of the parties choosing one, and these two a third, which last shall belong to no religious society. These are to keep order and not to decide the question.

6. The debate shall be opened by and shall (God willing) commence on the [18th inst.] at the Meeting-house at [9 o'clock, A.M.] and continue, if necessary, until [2 o'clock, P. M.] And it shall, if necessary, be continued during the same hours, and at the same place, and under the same superintendance (unless altered by mutual agreement,) from day to day, until both parties are satisfied.

W. L. MACCALLA.

No. 5.

Mr. Campbell to Mr. M'Calla.

Buffaloe Printing-Office, July 21st, 1823.

MR. MACCALLA,

SIR—Your letter of the 2d inst. but post marked the 8th inst. came to hand yesterday. It seems to import that the "terms of conference may not be so easily adjusted," as your first epistle portended. You object to my not forwarding the questions promised. My sole reason was, that my letter was sufficiently crowded without them. Besides, I supposed that a person proposing to discuss a subject of so great importance, and of so common occurrence, as that proposed by yourself, could be at no loss to answer any question connected therewith. If I had proposed to send you twenty-one questions on any other subject, than that proposed by yourself, or if I had proposed to give you no information of them until the day of debate; your objection would have been relevant and cogent; but as the circumstances are, it appears irrelevant and futile. I should never have proposed to discuss a subject, on which twenty-one questions could be proposed, that after two months deliberation, I would fear to encounter. So little attention to your

twenty-one questions has been paid by myself, that were I now asked what they are, I could not, from recollection, mention the half of them. On reading them once or twice, I saw the drift of them, and apprehended the peculiar turn of reflection that dictated them. With a very little reflection, I found myself able to answer each of them with a *yea* or a *nay*, with perhaps a very little explanation in one or two instances.

Though, you say, I have made no particular objection to your questions, you have several to the one which I proposed. Now, sir, were I to be so captious, or so precise in objecting, as you seem to be, we would not settle the preliminaries in a year. The fact is, I had many objections to your questions, as being inconsequential, confused, far fetched, and inapplicable to the faith or practice of christians, as respects christian Baptism. Yet knowing the peculiar delicacy of the feelings, and the keen sensibility of the conscience of Paido-baptist teachers in general, on such topics as those contained in your queries, I made no objection to any of them lest it should retard our meeting; but thought it best to stipulate, for the privilege of proposing an equal number.

You have favored me with three objections to my one question. It was well I did not propose propose twenty-one. The cogency of your three objections I confess myself too dull to apprehend. One thing appears pretty plain that you conceive the question—"Is infant affusion or Baptism a Divine institution," obliges you, as you express it, "to assume worse ground than that which in truth you occupy." This would indeed, be unreasonable, to make your ground of defence "*worse*" than it is. But while you allow believer's Baptism to be a Divine institution, and while you practice infant affusion, you maintain *that* to be a Divine institution also. Why then object to defend the precise thing which you practise? And to say you do not always practise it, is nothing to the merits of the question; for, inasmuch, as you sometimes practise it, as a Divine institution, it behoves you, for one such occasion to be able to prove it to be a Divine institution. And if the whole proposition cannot be proven—viz. *that infant affusion is a Divine institution*, to cut it into pieces, and to divide into words, syllables, vowels, or consonants, and prove it in piece-meal, will, every Logician knows, avail nothing.

With regard to who shall open, and who close the debate, I had thought that my statemant of the attendant circumstances of my giving the challenge alluded to, would have prevented such reasons as you assign for differing from me on that item. My stating that it behoved Mr. Walker to open the debate from the circumstance of his having given the challange was true, as far as it went, but it was also true, that his having the affirmative side of the question was that which rendered his commencement essentially necessary. In this controversy Baptists have nothing to prove as respects their practice. Paido-baptists agree with them, that a disciple immersed on a profession of the christian faith, has received christian baptism. Our practice then is correct, in this respect, Paido-baptists themselves being judges. They blame us for omitting to Baptize infants, but not for what we do, consequently it is they who have to prove their practice, and it is our duty to show that their arguments are inconclusive. In every controversy then with Paido-baptists, upon this topic, they affirm and we deny, they must commence and we

respond. But you profess to be ignorant of the origin of this rule of practice. I say it originates in *the fitness of things*, and is supported by long prescription. For precedent and for proof of its antiquity, I refer to the era of the Reformation. In the famous disputes at Leipsic between Eckius, Luther, and Carolostadius, June 27th, 1519. Eckius gave the challenge, took the affirmative, and opened the debate with Carolostadius. On the 4th of July, 1519, Eckius mantains the pope's supreme authority, Luther denies it, Eckius opens the debate, and Luther closes. The same took place at Baden, in May 1526, between Œcolampadius and Eckius. In the dispute between Luther and Œcolampadius concerning the "*real presence*," Luther affirms and Œcolampadius denies, Luther commences and Œcolampadius responds. See many other instances from page 102 to 200, *Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 3d.*

In the last place on this head, you allege that the possibility of converting an affirmative proposition into a negative, renders such a rule of procedure of very doubtful application. I admit that the negative proposition "*infant affusion is not a Divine institution*," may be converted into an affirmative, thus, infant affusion is a human tradition; yet the nature of things will not change with the words we may choose to represent them. Still the grand predicate "*Divine institution*" is denied of the subject "*infant affusion*," and the grand truth in pursuit of which the investigation proceeds, is denied of the subject of the proposition which, according to my views, will force the proposition into the form of a direct negative in the discussion.

I contend for this rule of procedure, then, on the ground of the fitness of things, and on the ground of long prescription in theological discussions.

I am willing to change the time proposed for holding the conference from the 1st to Wednesday the 15th of October. Later than that period, I cannot think would be expedient to defer our interview, as the weather will then be precarious, and the days short. Owing to the meeting of our Association, which I am under the necessity of attending, I could not, with any degree of propriety, promise to attend sooner than the first of October. And as you were so kind in mentioning New-Haven, Boston, New-York, and Philadelphia; I think for exhibiting to better advantage your very accommodating disposition, you should have mentioned London, Dublin, or Ghent; as water conveniences, and plenty of books equally recommend those places. I will however be still more accommodating than you, for I will go to your own village as aforesaid.

I will now propose you twenty-one questions, and thus prevent all further demur on this ground.

1. What is the doctrinal import of christian Baptism?
2. Are any infants members of the christian church?
3. Are infants members of the christian church by natural birth or Baptism?
4. Is the Abrahamic church a branch of the Noahic church? or in other words, were the patriarchs, before Moses, and the Jews after Moses, on eand the same church in different dispensations?
5. Was the sacrificial rite, before Moses, and circumcision, after Moses, one and the same *seal* in substance, though in different forms?
6. Was the church at Jerusalem, at Rome, at Corinth, at Samaria, or the first gentile church at Cesarea, a Baptist, or a Paido-baptist church?

7. What benefit does an infant receive from Baptism?

8. Does Baptism represent, seal and apply any thing to an infant?

9. Does Baptism become an effectual means of salvation to an infant?

10. Is not the present enjoyment of all the benefits and blessings of the New-Testament confined to believers?

11. Have not parents a right to Baptize their own infants, as the Jews circumcised theirs?

12. Ought not all the household of a believer, his slaves, and their children to be Baptized on the profession of his faith?

13. Ought not infants to be Baptized the eighth day?

14. Ought infant females to be Baptized, contrary to the law of circumcision?

15. Ought not Baptized infants to be admitted to the Supper?

16. Are infants under any vow or obligation from Baptism?

17. Were infants members of the patriarchal church?

18. Can there be a Baptism suited to infants, without faith, and a Baptism suited to believers, and yet, but one Baptism?

19. What is the *action* of Baptism?

20. Did the Apostles either Rantize or Baptize infants?

21. Is there a command in all the Bible to Rantize, or Baptize infants?

These questions I arrange on the principle of correspondencies, to be a per contra to those you have proposed, as far as the answers apprehended would come into contact. But, sir, neither your twenty-one questions nor mine, are the best course to come to a fair and clear issue. They afford us themes of copious verbosity, and would, no doubt, in the end, afford to all intelligent and impartial hearers, sufficient data, to judge on what side truth lay. But it is like walking nine miles, to come to a point accessible in one, and that, merely for the sake of showing our dexterity in walking. Did I, from my soul, desire to investigate the subject for my own good, and to exhibit it for the good of others; or did I cordially wish to help a fellow disciple out of the mire, or to be helped myself; I would calmly, in the fear of God, with humility of mind, and pure benevolence to yourself, and all others, who may be present on the occasion; and with all openness to conviction, propose four questions only for discussion.—One of these I conceive to be of great consequence, not only as respects baptism, but the whole exhibition of the christian religion.

1. Were the Jews in their corporate state, whether called national or ecclesiastical, an association, the *same* as the Christian Church?—This topic I would propose as a mere introduction to the subject primarily in view—then

2. What is the doctrinal import of Baptism?

3. Who is the proper *subject?*

4. What is the proper *action?*

As these questions equally comprehend the substance of your twenty-one questions and mine; I feel perfectly agreed, if you are, to investigate these in the fullest manner, by every possible means of illustration, and to confine the whole controversy to them. As I have dwelt chiefly on that article of arrangement, which you seem to make of the greatest consequence, I have no room to say any thing of the other eight items. They still appear to me preferable to any alterations you have proposed. But in case of your refusing to

accede to these rules of procedure, I have to propose that the three persons who shall sit as moderators, shall meet the day preceding our conference, and that they shall, after having heard read in their hearing our whole correspondence, decide, both what questions shall be discussed, and in what manner. I will pledge myself to comply with their decisions. This I think ought to be satisfactory, if the rules adopted by the committee, preceding the debate at Mount Pleasant will not please you. I have only to request, that this epistle be answered as promptly as I have answered yours; and that you would excuse this hasty scroll, I was interrupted twenty times since I sat down to write it.

Very respectfully your's,

A. CAMPBELL.

No. 6.

M'Calla to Campbell.

Augusta, Ky. August 8th, 1823.

Mr. Campbell.—In the progress of our correspondence, it is a pleasure to me to remember that this controversy is not one of my own seeking. Mine is a defensive attitude. Your challenge was bold, public and general: neither did it exhibit on its face the least design to take advantage of any stripling who might, in the faith of Israel's God, step out to meet you. You did not enumerate rules of debate———you did not prescribe weapons to your antagonist——you did not lay down what he was, and what he was not to defend—you did not require the last blow as a *sine qua non* to an encounter; but you simply stated what you would undertake to prove, and left your opponent to choose his own position, to which he certainly has a right. You expressly *renounced* all other restrictions to your challenge, except the right of an equal vote as to the time and place of meeting. Two years after the publication of the debate, you reiterate your defiance, without adding any farther condition. In the first page of your strictures on Father Ralston's Review, after complaining that Mr. Walker's friends under-rated his talents, you add "who on his side "of the question, since or before that debate, has done better? or who can do "better.....Is there no man in all the hosts of Pedo-baptists of greater ca-"pacity and industry than Mr. Walker? If there be, let the cause be main-"tained, and let not Mr. W. bear all the blame, as if the whole cause rested "on him." While thus bravely exulting over our armies, who, (as you imagined,) were panic struck at your superior prowess, why did you not inform us that besides an equal vote in the time and place, you must choose the position and weapons of your opponent, and that in addition to this, you must have the last fire? Why did you not tell us that you must have exclusive privileges, and not only choose your own theses, but you must also indite the identical words which we are to defend, although, in our conception, they may countenance errors which our souls abhor. With an invitation thus restricted, I have never complied, for such an one was never given; but, remember, sir, that the challenge actually published by yourself, has been accepted, with its accompanying condition.

Although I cannot admit the right of an antagonist to direct what I shall defend, yet when he gives a reason for preferring one proposition to another, I am willing to listen. Some of your reasons are as follows: "Why then object

"to defend the precise thing which you practise? ..... And if the whole pro-"position cannot be *proven*, viz. *that infant affusion is a Divine institution*, to "cut it into pieces, and to divide it into words, syllables, vowels or consonants, "and prove it in piece-meal, will, every logician knows, avail nothing." To your quesion I answer, that I am willing to defend the precise thing which I practise. I practise the Baptism of believers and their seed; whereas I am sorry to observe that you wish the world to think that these two stand in opposition to each other. I practise *aspersion*, though I equally approve of *ablution* and *affusion;* yet I am not willing to defend the latter to the exclusion of the former, nor even in oppugnation of *immersion*. In your remark concerning the cutting of a proposition into pieces, I scarcely know whether to consider you in earnest. It is hardly possible that I can have the honor of giving you the first information that some questions may be divided, and that this is practised by all eminent deliberative bodies, whether ecclesiastical or political. Do you think it derogatory to the *logical*, or grammatical, or rhetorical character of the Senate of the United States, that their ninth rule says, "If the question "in debate contain several points, any member may have the same divided." You will agree, it is to be hoped, that the subject and the mode of Baptism are distinct points, and that the question may be so divided, without making each word, syllable and letter, a distinct subject of discussion.

Much of your letter is spent to establish your claims to the grand desideratum, the last speech. *The fitness of things* and *long prescription* are the two pillars upon which your fabric rests. These, you say, give to the negative the right of closing. The negative, therefore, you are determined to have. Recollecting, however, that you have to take the affirmative of the proposition contained in your challenge, you bring *the fitness of things*, or (as you there call it) *the nature of things*, to a bearing upon the affirmative proposition, "*Infant affusion is a human tradition;*" and you shew, or think you shew, that it "*will force the proposition into the form of a direct negative in the discussion.*" If you can *force* an affirmative into a negative in order to secure the closing speech, it seems to me that very little more *force* would prove that I ought not to speak at all. This additional *force* is probably the very thing which caused Bishop Gunning of England, a hundred and fifty years ago, to deny those whom he had challenged, the liberty of replying.

In establishing a right upon the ground of prescription, you are aware that the custom must be made to appear. For this purpose you refer me to certain nameless occurrences in Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History, vol. III. p. p. 102—200. Will you be so kind as to send me so particular a reference that the place may be found in the London edition of 1698, as that contains nothing of the sort, in the pages marked, and the index refers to no conferences except those of Carthage and Jerusalem, p. p. 220, 321. The latter, A. D. 415, has nothing to the purpose. Neither has the former, which occurred four years sooner, except that the long disputes of the Donatists about the qualities of opposers and defenders, may appear to authorize the pertinacity of some with regard to the privileges conferred by affirmatives and negatives. At last Augustine obliged them to come to the main question, which was, "Where was the Catholic Church?" The Donatists opened and Augustine closed. Nothing can be gathered from such facts, unless *the fitness of things* can extract a favorable conclusion.

If we had Seckendorf's History of Lutheranism, and Loscherus's Acts and Documents of the Reformation referred to in Maclaine's Mosheim (4. 44. Charlest. ed. 1811,) we might possibly obtain some satisfaction on the other cases referred to. Du Pin is the only author whom you quote, and in the very short abstract which he gives, in half a page, of the dispute between Eckius and Carolostadius, which occupied a week, there is no account of the number or order of their speeches. He does not expressly tell us who closed, or for what reason. The debate which immediately followed between Eckius and Luther, was professedly on twenty-six propositions, half of them produced by each of the disputants, not dictated by one to the other. This debate is divided by Du Pin into a number of conferences. Several of the first were occupied in discussing the supremacy of the Pope, the subject to which your letter refers. You say, that Eckius, having the affirmative, opened the debate. Du Pin's narrative would encourage the belief that Luther opened. You say that Luther closed. Du Pin intimates that Eckius closed the first conference, and does not give the least hint who it was that closed the whole dispute on this topic. On the subject of indulgences, Eckius took the affirmative as before, and if Du Pin's abstracts give any information on this point, Eckius both opened and closed. Although he was so remarkable for voice and gesture, for information and readiness of utterance, he was exceedingly fond of this same privilege of opening and closing. Like Charles I. in his paper controversy with the noble Henderson, he appeared to think this a privilege due to his dignity. He obtained it in a conference with Melancthon at Ratisbon, as we are informed in a letter from Strasburg by Calvin to Farel. And if, according to Luther, as quoted by Seckendorf, and from him by Milnor, (4:346) Eckius took another more ungenerous advantage of Carolstadt in the conference above mentioned, I have no doubt that he both opened and closed in that contest; although Du Pin, a popish writer, has mentioned neither of these advantages. This author gives no information about the closing speech at Baden, although you say that Eckius opened and Œcolampadius closed. The same may be said of the conference at Berne, which occurred December 17th, 1527. At Marpurgh, (if that be the other instance to which you refer) Luther produced five articles of exception against the doctrine of the Zuinglians, of whom Œcolampadius was one. Du Pin does not positively say who opened and closed, but from his narrative I should draw a conclusion the very opposite of yours. It is a wonder that you did not add to this case a similar one which occurred at Lambeth in England, about the year 1584. It was a kind of conference between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Winchester on the one part, and Dr. Spark and Mr. Travers on the other. The latter gentlemen produced articles of exception against the church of England. The second of these was on Baptism. They objected to private and lay Baptism,—to their view of its absolute necessity and infallible efficacy,—to certain superstitious interrogatories, and the use of the cross. (Toulmin's Neal, 1.422.) Although I see no evidence of any privilege given to the negative, I have no doubt that much might be obtained by that perspicacity which has discovered such wonders in the foregoing instances.

If I am not as ignorant of arithmetic as you think me to be of logic, the questions contained in your letters and the appendix to your debate amount to one hundred and thirty-five. I am willing that you shall appear on the

scene of conflict with all these, and I am willing to meet you with the two following or similar propositions. 1st. Faith is not essential to Baptism. 2d. Submersion is not essential to Baptism. You would then have room to display your wit on the number and character of my questions, and I would have an opportunity of giving my opinion of your one hundred and thirty-five questions. Remember, however, my former proposals to meet you on the bare *subject and mode*, and my agreement to meet you on the proposition contained in your challenge, and the condition therein expressed.

W. L. MACCALLA.

No. 7.

Mr. Campbell to Mr. M'Calla.

July 14th, 1823.

MR. MACCALLA,

SIR—I wrote you on the 16th ult. an answer to your favor of May last; I also addressed a letter on the same subject to Dr. Keith. To these communications I have received no reply. A letter having become due before this date, I feel anxious to know, whether my letter was received, and whether you have answered it. I would send a copy of my reply per the bearer, but time forbids, as he is now on his way. You will please inform me on Mr. Logan's arrival, whether my letter was received.—And if you should have written a reply, at a date authorizing me to have received it, you must consider your letter as miscarried, and will, therefore, have the goodness to write again; as my business and arrangements require me to know results as soon as possible. Respectfully your's

A. CAMPBELL.

No. 8.

Mr. M'Calla to Mr. Campbell.

Mr. CAMPBELL,———Your letter of the 14th inst. sent by Mr. Logan, was received yesterday at church, and of course not opened until this morning. If my former one obtained as speedy a passage as this of your's, it must have arrived on the day of your writing; and but for the late departure of the mail, much sooner. As correspondence with this place by mail is generally tedious, it is probable that my letter has not yet miscarried. If it arrive, you will find that I am willing, with the help of God, to meet you on fair and practicable terms, in any city in America, and I may add, in England, Scotland or Ireland. But your terms I decline, for the present, because they are unfair and inconsistent. The only condition annexed to your public invitation, was that you should have *an equal vote in determining the time and place*. After I had accepted your *challenge*, as you expressly called it, you add in your letter to me, as another condition, that you must have the last speech, although the fact of Mr. Walker's giving the challenge, was the reason which you gave for your having the last speech at Mount-Pleasant. You appear to think with the lawyers, that the last speech is a matter of some importance, and that it must be gained, if possible, whether you give or receive a challenge, and whether you assume the affirmative or the negative of the proposition in dispute.

You do not object to the discussion of the questions which I sent to you, and therefore suggest the propriety of having the meeting notified to the public forthwith. Yet your letter is so constructed that you would consider this publication a virtual agreement on my part to discuss an equal number of questions written by yourself, which I have never seen, and to which I might have very serious objections, after seeing them. My desire is, that with the grace of Christ in my heart, my lips may be consecrated to the defence of truth and righteousness. He who disputes from ambition or ostentation, may promise you a debate at random: but shew me the questions first, as I have shewn you mine, and I hope that God will direct me to a suitable answer.

If you cannot agree to discuss my questions without obtrusive conditions and if after examining your questions, I should not approve of them, the proposal of my letter was, that we should discuss "*the subject and the mode of Baptism*" without any question, or that we should meet upon the proposition contained in your challenge, to the discussion of which you have dared the Pedobaptist world. As you gave the challenge, and as you take the affirmative of your own proposition, both your rules give to me the closing speech. This however, my letter does not ask, but requests that both parties may have liberty to speak until they are satisfied.

As Dr. Keith by showing your correspondence with him to the citizens, has made it public, it is not improper for me to observe that it was premature in you to tell him that your proposals could not be *manfully* or *justly* rejected by me. I am informed that in his answer *he* has represented me as a forward enemy of the Baptists, and as disposed to retreat from this controversy. No person acquainted with the state of things here, could expect him to give me a favorable character. I am constitutionally timid, but I hope that through grace, I am not malicious. This same grace has also strengthened my heart against the fear of man, so that although I have not the talents and preparation to be desired in such a controversy, I am willing to trust in the Lord, and encounter even the hero of Mount-Pleasant. At least the question, who has acted manfully and generously? and who wishes to retreat? will one day be submitted to the judgment of the United States,

W. L. MACCALLA,

Augusta, July 21st, 1823.

No. 9.

Mr. Campbell to Mr. M'Calla.

Buffaloe Creek, August 23d, 1823.

MR. MACCALLA,

SIR—Your's of the 8th inst. was received last night. It differs very much both in spirit and style from your first. In your first you objected to meeting me on the bare ground of my challenge; saying that I should not understand you as professing a willingness to confer with me on the truth or falsehood of the statement in my proclamation; "That infant sprinkling is a human tradition, and injurious to the well-being of society religious and political." You then proposed twenty-one questions. In your next you complained of the one question I proposed, and because I had not sent you the twenty-one questions, I then promised to send. In my next, I sent you twenty-one questions, and

also proposed reducing the topics to four questions. In your last, you profess a willingness to be off both from your own twenty-one questions and mine; and agree to meet me on the bare words of my challenge, or on two propositions, both *negatives*, and thus to force me to give you the last speech. In my first, I proposed rules of conference similar to those framed at Mount-Pleasant, to expedite our interview, and to regulate our discussion. To those you object as inequitable. I proposed in my last, that if the rules I had proposed, should not meet your approbation, as yours had not met with mine, the three moderators should decide, both the questions to be discussed, and the manner of discussing them, and pledge myself to abide by their decission. Of this you take no notice; but very gravely and generously proceed to accuse me with departing from my challenge; as offering new conditions; and appending a sine qua non to them. This, I was about to say, is worse than the quibbling of school-boys. You should anticipate that there is a probability of our correspondence meeting the public eye; and that whatever your design may be in throwing obstacles in the way, it will, perhaps, appear as though you wished to be off from the conference forever. It certainly strikes me so. Otherwise, why, in the name of common sense, would you object to me, as proposing terms of conference, as a sine qua non, when *I proposed to refer the whole matter to men, and to submit to their rules?* If this is inequitable, all arbitrations and references are inequitable. If this is inequitable, and my rules are also inequitable, then it follows that your rules are equitable, or that they must be so considered: at least, they are such as please you better than those you would expect from a committee. Moreover, while you talk so much of my proposing questions and theses for you, you should remember that *you began* by proposing questions for me; for had you, at first, proposed to meet me on the ground of my challenge, and the subject matter of it, I should never have proposed any questions at all. You have, or appear to have, the rare talent of committing faults, and of charging them on another. You project a course, and when I follow you, you gravely censure me as departing from my printed challenge; and, as leading you off to worse ground than you occupy. As to the latter, instead of leading *off*, my proposal was to lead you *on* publicly to assume, and if possible to defend the precise ground you occupy in contradistinction to Anti-paido-baptists; that is, that infant Rantism, or superfusion is a Divine ordinance; for surely, there is no dispute between us and you about believer's Baptism. This, I grant you, includes both the subject, and the very action itself, which the law of Christ specifies and ordains. This therefore being the very point at issue between us, I suggested to you the propriety of assuming it as such, and, if possible, of proving it to be a Divine ordinance; which it certainly behoves you to do, so long as you continue to practise it in the Divine name. But, perhaps, your objection against assuming this ground, in the first instance (for to this we must come at length, as the alone question at issue) is, that it would lead you to take the affirmative; for it seems you are quite averse to this, and are determined, if possible to be on the negative; as I think you must be convinced that it behoves the affirmative to open the discussion. As to what you say concerning my references to Du Pin, being at present from home on a journey, I have not that book at hand: but if you are willing to rest the matter upon my proving from that writer, and others, that the affirmative has usually opened every discussion,

where theses were so limited, I will engage to do it, or to concede to you the closing speech. But why you should have dwelt so much on this topic, as a sine qua non, when I consented to be govened by the rules of the moderators, without ever so much as noticing this important concession, this just and reasonable alternative, quite astonishes me; it seems to argue something very forbidding in a religious antagonist. When you will not agree to have the matter referred, it is evident you look for an advantage. If I *must* give you an advantage I will do it *gratuitously;* not under the semblance of a *right.* I will, then, to obviate all difficulties on my side, if possible, propose to meet you at Augusta, or rather at Mays-Lick, on Wednesday, the 15th day of October *next*, the day before, or the day after, as may best suit *your convenience*, at 11 o'clock, A. M.; and that you shall have the privilege of both *opening* and *closing* the discussion, and of speaking *twice* for my *once:* that the words of my challenge shall be the subject of discussion, and that the moderators shall act as aforesaid. I will either meet you thus, or I will agree that the moderators, on the day before our meeting, after having heard all our correspondence, make the rules by which we shall proceed. If I *must* give advantage, I will do it all at once, and *manifestly*. Talk no more then, if you please, about sine qua nons. I will meet you as aforesaid, if the Lord will, either on your twenty-one questions and mine; or on the words of my challenge; or on the four questions proposed in my last; or on the decision of the three moderators that shall be chosen. I have mentioned Mays-Lick, as by letters sent me from Kentucky, I understand it to be a much better place than Augusta for accommodating the country in general, and that many more could attend. I request you, if determined to meet me, to inform Dr. Keith, on the receipt of this, and to let him know, to which of the proposed terms you choose to accede; and also to have our intended meeting made as public as possible. You will also please to write me immediately on receipt of this. Please also to recollect, that the challenge which elicited mine, came forth from *your* armies; and talk no more of the stripling David; nor of the Philistine, Goliah. How good soever the analogy may be between you and the tender stripling; for our part we disclaim comparison with the mighty Philistine.

P. S. I wrote this hastily, while stopping for dinner on a journey, you will therefore please excuse inaccuracies of style, and want of method.

Your's respectfully,

A. CAMPBELL.

No. 10.

Mr. M'Calla to Mr. Campbell.

Augusta, Sept. 15th, 1823.

MR. CAMPBELL——If, as you intimate, I am afraid to meet you, it should be matter of regret, when we consider the goodness of my cause, the power of Christ, and the experience which I have had of his faithfulness and condescending goodness. You are mistaken, however, in one statement which may encourage you in this belief. It is that I try to force you to give me the last speech. If this were true, it might be an evidence of fear or something worse. Your assertion of the fact is as improper, as your manner of giving me an unsought privilege is impolite.

Although to be afraid of so formidable an antagonist would be, in some measure, excusable, I am not willing to lie under your charge of uncorteous behaviour for omitting to notice your proposals for a theological arbitration. In your letter of July 21st, you propose that the moderators, "shall after having "*heard read in their hearing*, our whole correspondence, decide both what "questions shall be discussed, and in what manner. I will pledge myself to "comply with their decisions." This I omitted to notice for want of room; because you had already my opinion twice on such measures, and because I did not wish to expose every inadvertency of which you might be guilty. If I were, in haste, to offer such a proposal, I would thank my correspondent for passing it in silence. In my letter of July 2d, I expressed an opinion that such a proceding was nothing better than theological Quixotism. In a letter of July 21st, I considered that to promise a debate at random arose from ambition or ostentation. When you, in your pledge copied above, commit the very fault here reproved, did decorum require that I should repeat my condemnation? or was it necessary for me to insinuate my suspicions, that you chose ground which you knew had been abandoned, for the purpose of giving to your candor and bravery a more illustrious and uninterrupted display?

Concerning this proposal you say, "if this is inequitable, then all arbitrations and references are inequitable;" and you insinuate that a refusal on my part is an indirect impeachment of the ability or integrity of a committee. The third rule proposed in your letter of June 16th, and in the system adopted at Mount-Pleasant, is, "that these moderators shall merely keep order, and not pronounce judgment on the merits of the debate." Did you, by this rule, mean any insinuation of ignorance or corruption? Did you, by this proposal, mean to make war upon all arbitrations and references, which are intended to decide upon the merits of causes? It is well for school-boys to receive subjects for composition and declamation. It is well for students of theology to receive subjects for trial exercises. In both these cases, however, as well as in arbitrations and references, the *merits* are decided by the committees. This, which is really the most innocent part of the business, and which has been the practice of the literary and theological world, time immemorial, does not please you; but you are delighted with the thought of returning to a state of minority, of engaging in a sort of polemical fencing, on a subject arbitrarily dictated by others, and concerning the tendency of which to good or evil we are utterly ignorant. If the long parliament of England which you hold in such contempt, had been men of your liberal conscience, they would have given Archbishop Laud less trouble about the *et cetera* oath. But they complain, "We are here to swear to we know not what, to something that is 'not expressed; by which means we are left to the *arbitrary* interpretation of "the judge." You and men of the same spirit often accuse us of a slavish adherence to the Assembly of divines convened by this Parliament. This correspondence should cause you to inquire again who it is that is most disposed to servile compliances. Is it the man who cautiously and prayerfully examines and compares the Westminster articles, and then adopts them because he finds that form of sound words consistent with the word of God?—Is it he who, in sacred things, is unwilling to make a leap in the dark? or is it that man who pompously pledges himself to abide by the future decision of an unknown and mixt committee? and who takes frequent occasions of ridi-

culing the tender consciences of those who would rather know a matter before they answer it.

This alternative of your proposals is of course rejected. I must treat your four questions in the same way. On the three last of them we can come to no immediate issue. Lest a silent concealment of my disgust should again incur your resentment, I must tell you that the first of these four, and scores of others from the same quarter, are only calculated to darken counsel by words without knowledge.

To excuse yourself for so long insisting upon the right of prescribing what I should defend, you say that I first dictated twenty-one questions to you. I can find no excuse for this statement, except that you were on a journey when you made it, and had not my first letter with you. You will there find that they were "respectfully submitted for your consideration, and (if you please) for your adoption or rejection, amendment or selection, enlargement or diminution." Did I then, or have I ever since, made your adoption of them a condition of our meeting? So far was I from acting the part of a dictator, that you have more than once commended the spirit of that letter. So far from insisting upon their adoption after they were trammelled by your obscure and ambiguous questions, I have incurred the censure of inconsistency by abandoning them without a struggle. This I did in silence, not, as Dr. Keith has said, because I was afraid to meet you, but because I was afraid to tell you my opinion of your questions, lest it should prevent a meeting, by raising too high that magisterial indignation which has been manifested in several of your letters, and which, from a long habit of domineering without control, has become quite ungovernable. This same motive induced me entirely to suppress the first letter which was penned for your address, because on reading it to my friend, Major Morris, he gave it as his opinion that, by irritating your feelings with severe animadversions upon your book, it would prove an obstruction to our meeting. To the same cause you may ascribe my silence hitherto concerning your character, although mine occupied the introduction to your first letter. Whatsoever may have moved you to magnify my reputation and standing, I am sorry that I cannot praise your orthodoxy or piety. The numerous, respectable and almost uniform reports against you in these respects are corroborated by your various writings. It is said that you are polluted with the theology of your favorite author, the disciple of Dr. Priestly, whose Socinian and infidel pravity has been so completely exposed by his Baptist countryman, the excellent Andrew Fuller. If this be a mistake, you will rejoice to correct it; and be assured that such a favor will give me no less pleasure than yourself. Until this is done, no devoted minister of the DIVINE SAVIOUR can desire any other intercourse with you than as an adversary.

Your declaration that I am convinced that the affirmative should open, (and of course, the negative close,) notwithstanding my assurance to the contrary, is a much more modest insinuation than you are accustomed to making. In this respect it resembles a very delicate remark in your first address at Mount Pleasant. It is in the following words; "I cannot persuade myself to believe that they who affirm that Baptism came in the room of circumcision, really

think so." A real Christian who could utter such things, not from hasty passion, or settled malignity, but from sincere conviction, could hardly wish to see me, except as an antagonist. In this capacity I am inclined to meet you; not from any favorable opinion of your piety or sincerity, but because you are allowed (and I suppose justly) to be the greatest champion of Anabaptism, in America—because you have charged the Pedo-baptist world with administering a factitious and pernicious ordinance;—because you have publicly challenged them to stand on their defence;—because you have publicly gloried in their silence, as arising from guilt, timidity, or incompetency;—and because your partizans have bantered me, and thus given a particular direction to your general invitation.

To this invitation I at first objected, because although, it brings us to a speedy issue, yet it confounds things quite distinct, and it is clothed in unbecoming language. True, its exceptionable phrase, *infant sprinkling*, is not so low and profane an expression as David Jones' *watery hocus pocus*, yet it is intended as a sneer, and of course will never, by the lovers of piety and courtesy, be made a member of a question in debate. This proposition, however, with all its confusion of points and vulgarity of expression, is still preferable to any other alternative which you have offered. My former repeated acceptance of it is now confirmed. As you were mistaken about the superior eligibility of Mays-Lick, I was reluctant to comply with your wish. Your friends and corrospondents, Dr. Keith and Major Davis undertook the responsibility of requesting on your behalf that Washington might be the place of meeting. As this was to your advantage, I consented. A copy of our joint publication is enclosed. W. L. MACCALLA.

No. 11.

Mr. Campbell to Mr. M'Calla.

September 27th, 1823.

MR. MACCALLA:

SIR—Your long looked for favor of the 15th inst. came to hand last night. It assures me that you are now disposed to meet me, and have actually agreed to meet me at Washington, Mason county, Ky. on the 15th October, on the proposition printed in my general invitation. But under what regulations, I know not; as you have declined referring the matter to the three moderators, and have said nothing, in your last, on what rules or order should be observed.—It appears your *conscience is too tender* to allow the moderators such a liberty, as to say, how the debate should be conducted, and which of all the topics and questions proposed should be discussed. It appears also that you omitted to notice this proposal in a former letter for the want of room; yet, there is more than one third of a page of your letter blank; so that you must have had more to say about it, in your letter of the 8th August, than in yours of the 15th inst. for you do not say so much on it in your last, as might have been written on the blank in your preceding epistle, and you might as well strive to arouse my feelings then as now. It moreover appears, that your conscience was not so tender, on the subject of my character for "orthodoxy and piety," as to prevent you from insinuating, nay, from declaring that

Dr. Priestly's disciple was my favorite author, contrary to all evidence or fact from any thing in my writings, or from any *respectable* source. You shall, perhaps, soon know that I have no favorite authors in religion, but one; and that man who says I am a first or second hand disciple of Priestly's or of any socinian author, is a man of no piety nor respectability of character: nor is there a man living who can say, or *dare* say in my presence, that I ever expressed a sentiment derogatory to the Lord Jesus as a Divine Redeemer, as Emmanuel God with us. Such insinuations may be circulated in Kentucky, by those who would wish to impair my influence, in supporting a truth more hated by many of the "orthodox and pious" than socinianism: but here we regard them not. As to my piety, I know I have nothing to boast of, God alone is my judge. As to my external deportment, men can judge. And whenever you bring forward any specific charge of immorality, or unchristian deportment, I will try to refute it. But as I shall, Deo volente, at some future day expatiate on the style and sentiment of your last, I proceed to say, that your reference to your first letter, in relation to the twenty-one questions is *partial*; and not altogether correct. You did propose the twenty-one questions in the first instance as you have quoted, but afterwards, you tell me, in the same letter, that you "fairly conclude that (unless suppressed by mutual consent,) they will all be discussed, if we should ever meet." Query: Have we *mutually* agreed to suppress them? Or are they to be discussed at our meeting? I request that you will meet me at Washington, the 14th day of October, at 11 A. M. in order to arrange the business, for you have not agreed to meet me on any of the terms proposed, in my last. At least you have not informed me so. But you have told me that you are to meet me as "an adversary," as ho Satanas. Well, I hope you will remember, that when Michael the archangel disputed with the *adversary*, about the body of Moses, he durst not bring against him a railing accusation. As you are celebrated for piety and orthodoxy, and I, for the want of them, a great deal will be expected from you, and very little from your

Humble Servant

A. CAMPBELL.

P. S.—It would appear, from the circumstance of your contrasting what I said of your high standing, &c. with your deep sense of my want of "orthodoxy and piety," that you understood the high standing mentioned, to mean your high standing for "piety and orthodoxy." Lest this should have any undue influence on your mind, I think it right to explain it.—You were never described to me by any Baptist or Paedo-baptist, as of high standing for either "piety or orthodoxy," but that you once stood high as a lawyer, if I mistake not, as a chaplain in the army, and now as a presbyterian teacher: and that you were highly distinguished for a peculiar kind of argumentative faculty, which you have displayed in debates, in sermons, and in ecclesiastical courts.—Excuse this much to prevent mistake. A. C.

No. 12.

M'Calla to Campbell.

Philadelphia, August 1st, 1826.

Mr. Campbell———In yours of Sept. 27, 1823, you observe, "I shall. *Deo volente*, at some future day, expatiate on the style and sentiment of your last." I have long waited in vain to see these promised remarks. In the commencement of your letter you inform us that my "long looked for favour" had come to hand. It must have arrived in a week or two after you looked for it. If you languish under a fortnight's suspense, when expecting a letter from me, how cruel is it for you to keep me during several long years, from witnessing in how interesting a manner, you can "*expatiate on the style and sentiment*" of my very sentimental effusion! As it is probable that this, like many promises of marriage made by professed ministers of the gospel, is never to be fulfilled, I am compelled to notice your little letter which was intended as a precursor of the more splendid epistle.

Not long after writing, you discovered in a personal interview, that you were mistaken in insinuating that I was reluctant to settle definite rules of conference. At that meeting the objections came from yourself; and were accordingly, at a subsequent meeting, relinquished by yourself. All that I asked was, that you should have no unfair advantage.

A remark in your letter, which really appears specious, on account of an uncandid concealment and an incorrect assertion, reads as follows, Viz. "It appears also that you omitted to notice this proposal, [for three autocratical arbitrators] in a former letter for the want of room; yet there is more than one 3d of a page of your letter blank; so that you must have had more to say about it in your letter of the 8th of August than in yours of the 15th inst. for you do not say so much on it in your last, as might have been written on the blank in your preceding epistle." The letter to which you refer, forms No. 10 of these Collateral Papers. The matter to which you refer, occupies the second and third paragraphs of that letter. Look back and see whether those paragraphs which fill a *page* of your *printed* book, could be conveniently *written* on *a fraction of a page*. Read also the first of those paragraphs, and see whether the want of room was the only reason for my silence; or whether it was not only one of three reasons, either of which would have been sufficient if I had had three pages instead of a third of a page. If you could place me in an awkward predicament by fair ingenuity or wit, I should laugh and admire, instead of answering. But your endeavouring to do it by concealing facts and inventing fictions, involuntarily reminds me of one of your many endearing remarks to Mr. Greatrake. If I recollect rightly, you informed him, that you knew a reptile, (and of this I have no doubt,) that you knew a reptile, which could creep through a

hole less than itself, and swallow a body larger than itself. After so long and so intimate an acquaintance with such a personage, it is no wonder that you can reduce the reasons of my conduct to one third of their number, and make one third of a page holds as much as a whole page.

In No. 9, you accused me of dictating twenty one questions. This I refuted in No. 10, by quoting the plainest declaration to the contrary. In your last you renew the attack in another way. The following are your words, viz.——"your reference to your "first letter in relation to the twenty-one questions is *partial*, and "not altogether correct. You did propose the twenty-one in "the first instance as you have quoted, but afterwards you tell "me, in the same letter, that you 'fairly conclude that (unless "suppressed by mutual consent,) they will all be discussed, if "we should ever meet.' Query: Have we mutually agreed to "suppress them? or are they to be discussed at our meeting?" Now your reasoning would be perfectly conclusive, if you could establish as a Major Proposition, that submitting articles to future negotiation was equivalent to dictating them. Your argument would then run as follows'——"Proposing subjects "for debate, is an imperious and dictatorial method of imposing those questions upon an Antagonist.——But W. L. "M'Calla did *respectfully submit* twenty-one questions for my "*consideration*, and *(if I please)* for my *adoption or rejection*, "*amendment or selection, enlargement or diminution.* This "same W. L. M'Calla did, moreover, in the same letter, *'fairly "conclude, that (unless suppressed by mutual consent,) they will "all be discussed if we should ever meet.'* And all this the said "W. L. M'Calla wrote, before there had been any mutual "agreement on the subject, and when no one could tell whether "they are to be discussed or not.——Therefore it is as plain as "that Mr. Greatrake is a great sinner; or that Sidney Rigdon is "a second Solomon; that this imperious Kentuckian has dictated these questions to me, and means that I shall discuss them, "whether there is a mutual agreement to that effect or not."

Shortly after the commencement of the discussion. you were probably convinced that this conclusion was incorrect. I earnestly and repeatedly requested that several topics embraced in these questions might be entirely suppressed. I wished to adhere to scriptural evidence, and leave ecclesiastical history, in relation to the subject of baptism, and the mode of baptism, and the origin of the Baptist Church, out of the question. This would drop many of the twenty-one questions; perhaps every one which was not *directly* embraced in your challenge. It was soon discovered that these subjects could not be omitted by mutual consent. You probably suspected, that the request to pass them by, proceeded from want of preparation. This caused you to press the points in what you would call a dictatorial manner. While you were doing this, a gentleman took me aside. He

entreated me not to urge my request any more, but to take you at your word, and he and others would continue to attend, if the discussion should last a month. I consented, and after this, all the mournful entreaties for suppressing these topics, came from the other side : but the dye was cast by your own act, and you had to bear the consequences. In your letter you tell us of some things which no living man *can* say, or *dare* say in your august *presence*. How different this menacing air, from the doleful ditty of some of your plaints, when contending with one who dared to tell the truth. What a pity that you had not kept your threats for the exclusive use of such men as Mr. Birch. your writer of challenges, and Mr. Rigdon your writer of certificates.

Lest your good opinion should have an undue influence on my mind, you are careful to inform me very exactly what you have heard and what you have not heard, concerning my character. Now sir, do you really think that a serious Christian would covet the praise of an avowed enemy to religious exercises and institutions, and even to moral duties and associations? But if you ever heard that I once stood high as a lawyer, it was probably from one who was about as well qualified to write my life as you were to write my speeches. I once attempted to study law, but failed for the very same reason that has made you fail in the ministry ; that is, I had no relish for the profession. A lawyer who conscientiously recognizes his responsibility to God, and keeps truth and justice (whether for or against his client) steadily in view, may spend his breath usefully, in perpetually disputing about wounds and bruises, and thefts and murders, and frauds and forgeries, and money and lands and goods and chattels and houses and horses and hogs : And perhaps the man who informed you of my high standing at the bar, would admit that, in that pursuit, I could with the help of Providence have amassed a considerable portion of this world's wealth, and have risen a little higher than the bar, and have obtained the admiration and praise of those who now traduce me. But the God of the bible, for Christ's sake, and by the agency of his Holy Spirit, was pleased to convince a perishing sinner that those emoluments were not the most valuable. My ambition reached after nobler pursuits and higher rewards. I am willing to dispute with as much ardor and perseverance as any lawyer ; but it is in a better cause : and if I receive no other return, than the sweet comforts of religion, which attend a disinterested and conscientious performance of duty, I prefer it to their gold and silver. It is true that I have sometimes to fight with wild beasts at Ephesus, or if you please, at Washington, (Kentucky) and Lombard Street Church (Philadelphia,) but I decidedly prefer the lot of a gracious and faithful minister of the Gospel, with all its thankless mortifications, dangers and toils, to that of any other man under the sun.

This has not been my feeling alway, nor even from the commencement of my religious profession. It was after that period that I obtained licence to plead law, and was admitted to

practice in the Lexington Court. But when that was done my legal career was done. I never advocated one cause. But if I had done it, it was always my determination that, in the face of all consequences, I would uniformly and invariably avoid quibbles, prevarications and falsehoods, as I would avoid sin, death and hell. Oh! how many transgressions of this sort have stained the character of one who does not pretend to be a lawyer. but a Bishop, and even a Bishop-maker. Among his many tricks, I will remind you of one, the mention of which was designedly, postponed to the close of our correspondence. Several years ago he blew a trumpet on Mount Pleasant, challenging any man in the world to contend with him on equal terms. His invitation being at last accepted by your humble servant, the great man insisted that as he had had the last fire in a former engagement, so he must in this, though for different and even opposite reasons. At last the fitness of things and long prescription were announced as the strong holds which should secure his object. His manner of supporting the last position is the cause which brings the subject now before us. In No 5, of these Collateral Papers he endeavours to prove his prescriptive right to the closing speech, by referring to particular interviews of a similar character, in which Luther, Œcolampadius, Eckius and Carolostadius were parties, and then referring to ninety-eight pages of Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History in the lump, for what he carelessly calls "MANY OTHER INSTANCES." After my informing him in No. 6, of my inability to find any of these many nameless instances, I proceeded to shew the perfect irrelevancy of those to which he particularly referred. This he answers in No. 9, in the following words, viz: "As to what you say concerning my references "to Du Pin being at present from home on a journey, I have not "that book at hand: but if you are willing to rest the matter "upon my proving from that writer, and others, that the affirm-"ative has usually opened every discussion, where theses were "so limited, I will engage to do it, or to concede to you the clos-"ing speech." After such a display of learning, and such an array of authorities, at the commencement of this discussion, who could have expected such a retreating, dodging, drivelling answer at the close of it? After having gallopped into this question with such pomp and confidence, is it not surprising that he should slip out of it with such inoffensive tameness? In this answer he insinuates, as usual, that it was I who wished the closing speech, and that on certain conditions he would consent to let me have it. What he has here insinuated, he asserts in the plainest terms, in the close of his report. He well knows that I never descended so low as to ask this or any other exclusive privilege. Moreover, in this answer he shifts the question from the right of closing to the duty of opening. as if proving it my place to open, would secure the close to him: whereas he could not deny that prescription amongst us, would secure the closing to the one who opened, instead of to his antagonist.—Finding that Du Pin was to his cause, what Jonah was to the ship——only calculated to sink it, the above answer shews that

he threw his author overboard, or which amounts to the same thing, he jumped overboard himself by starting on a journey, which of course, must be a satisfactory reason for not consulting the work before his departure or after his return ! ! After his return, he wrote No. 11 above, without giving me the desired information. nor has he yet sent it, although he has had time to "expatiate on the style and sentiment of" all that I ever wrote in my life. The question was much agitated between the parties in Washington, the day before the debate. Neither Du Pin nor any other author was called for, although I had brought his massy volumes and several other works to the ground, for Mr. Campbell's use, at the request of his friend Dr. Keith. Thus have you asserted cases which had no existence, distorted those which had, and at last abandoned both the real and fictitious cases, not with the candour of a man, but with the unprincipled shuffling of a pettifogger. Yet this is the man who, in No. 9 above, replies to reasoning which he could not refute, by saying that it was "worse than the quibbling of schoolboys."

W. L. M'CALLA.

No. 13.

On facts, and on the truth of Mr. Campbell's Report.

From W. L. M'Calla to Col. Jos. Crockett, near Nicholasville, (Ky.)

My Dear Uncle,———Your letter, for which I have never before had an opportunity of thanking you, has touched a chord which vibrates with sincere and tender affection for yourself and my beloved aunt and cousins, ever since my infant eyes could distinguish you in the remote Kentucky forest in which I was born. My love for your family is by no means weakened from the fact that several of them have become Baptists. The debate with Mr. Campbell prevented me from visiting your pious Baptist son Dr. Jos. C. at his request, in that sickness from which we hope that he ascended to eternal health. And cordially did I wish that your daughter and her husband Dr. Bower, and all my Baptist friends could have witnessed the forbearance with which I treated real christians of that denomination. With a good conscience I can say, that in that controversy, and every other, truth was my object. For this reason, I never asked the right of closing, but only of speaking until satisfied. When Colonel Morris of Augusta, asked me, before Mr. Campbell's arrival, what I would do about the last speech, I told him that if we engaged on equal terms, the last address was of so little importance to me, that I had no expectation of speaking last. I then assigned and at the same time illustrated my reason for this indifference, by an allusion to an animal with which you know we Kentuckians have to be familiar, from the time that we can hold a bridle. A running horse shews when he is out of breath, by the motion of his tail. I observed to Col. Morris that when my point

was gained, and my antagonist began to switch his tail, my method was to leave him the field; for he would only show his own exhaustion, and proclaim my victory. From Mr. Campbell's letters, in Nos. 9 and 11, of these preliminary papers, Dr. Keith, his representative, agreed that he had relinquished his claims for privilege, and was willing to debate on equal terms in alternate speeches, according to the tenor of our correspondence. His words, in his own hand writing, are now before me. They are the following, viz: "It is our understanding of Mr. A. Campbell's letter of August 23d, 1823, to W. L. M'Calla, that he "relinquishes his claims. But when we met at Major Davis's in Washington, the day before the debate, he interposed several difficulties. He insisted again upon his much loved closing speech, and as this was refused, he required as an indispensable alternative, that I should both open and close, and speak twice tohis once!! He had discovered also, that, to my feeble health, writing was then, as it is now, exceedingly difficult, and to any great extent, impossible. He therefore urged as another *sine qua non*, before unheard of, that I should write down for his use during the debate, any portion of my argument which he should call for! On my pleading the impossibility of the thing, he, instead of relaxing, became more pertinacious. My refusal was then peremptory. After this, he appeared to agree to fair terms, and consented to have them immediately committed to paper. As it is generally disagreeable to me to write even ten lines, I requested that he would take the pen. He did so, but to the astonishment of the company, embodied in the written articles, his demands which had just been renounced. In dealing with such men, it has, for many years, been deemed important to have a witness with me. On this occasion, an eminent lawyer of Washington, Mr. Paxton, at whose house I lodged, favored me with his company. Before he could send me his written testimony concerning this and a subsequent conversation, as he declared he would, it pleased Providence to remove him from this world. Yet God has so ordered it, that the autograph of those rules is now in my hands, with the signature of the parties, and the three moderators, attesting that the exceptionable articles were afterwards exploded by mutual consent. This point was not, however, gained at that meeting. He persisted in his unreasonable demands. Just before we parted, I told him that I should endeavour to attend punctually, at the time and place appointed for the debate, and would, with the help of God, defend the truth against the allegations of his challenge, whether with or without written rules. In the evening, he, in company with Mr. Rigdon and Mr Vaughn, came over to Mr. Paxton's, where he found me pleasantly seated in a circle of friends, chiefly ladies. Immediately after taking his chair, he informed me that he was willing to drop the objectionable articles, and come to an agreement on the remaining rules which he had written. After I had expressed my satisfaction, we agreed to have them copied, signed and attested, the next morning, and put into the hands of the moderators. He then very abruptly demanded my au-

thority for insinuating, as in No. 10 above, that he was tainted with the theology of Robinson, a disciple of Dr. Priestley. As this, and every thing else, during the interview, was spoken by him in such a manner as to engross the attention of the company, I observed with a smile, that, if he chose, we would attend to that subject at another time and place. But he was not to be put off. He pressed the point, and demanded my author. Just at this moment, there was in my mind an association, which need not be explained, between my informant and an intelligent, witty, and much admired young lady of the company. I, therefore, with a grave countenance, tinged with drollery, asked her if she did not hold herself responsible for this information. It had the desired effect. The feelings of the company which had begun to be on the rack, were relaxed with a hearty laugh, in which the young lady, discovering my design, cordially joined. It was soon discovered that Mr. Campbell did not enjoy the joke. He observed that he did not think the insinuation in question to be such as would come from a gentleman. This cast a gloom over every countenance in the room except my own. Every one had expected, (and in this I agreed with them,) that Mr. Campbell had at least sense enough to make him behave with common decency in such a company. But this was expecting too much from the animal whose indiscriminate ferocity had endeavoured to adorn his den with the bones of Mrs. Judson, a female Baptist Missionary. Mr. Campbell's remarks hurt me in no other way than as it made me the unwilling occasion of having the company insulted, and that in the house of a high-minded gentleman, whose patience and prudence were put to a severe trial. Being unwilling to contend on such a subject at all, and especially in Mr. Paxton's parlour, I arose, took a drink of water, and sauntered about the room with great composure. But still his pronouncing me no gentleman, rang in their ears, and sealed their faculties in mute astonishment. To relieve them from a long and painful silence, and at the same time to turn the subject entirely, I sat down ; and, taking a piece of alum out of my pocket, observed to the company, that for some time I had been troubled with a sore tongue, and had found alum a good remedy. "Yes sir," said Mr. Campbell, "but that does not prove that I am a Socinian." 'No sir,' said I, 'but I thought that your tongue also might be the better of a little alum.' This again relieved the company in some measure. But Mr. Campbell received no farther attention from me, and but little from any present ; so that he and Mr. Rigdon withdrew. To Mr. Vaughn, who remained by request, Mr. Paxton expressed himself with great freedom. Mr. Vaughn, perhaps not expecting such conduct, was at a loss for an apology. At last he said that Mr. Campbell was an Irishman, and that an Irishman ought always to have the privilege of speaking twice. This may be true of Mr. Campbell, but not of such Irishmen as now compose the majority of my congregation.

As it is contrary to my wish to interrupt the argument with narration, I would here inform you of some things which Mr.

Campbell has omitted or misstated in his report. He omits Mr Verdeman's laughing and afterward denying it, and remaining under a stigma for this conduct, although he got Mr. Vaughn and even Mr. Campbell to try to convince the people that the witnesses against him might not exactly understand the meaning of the word *laugh!!* Instead of telling the public that Mr. Verdeman opposed my reading certain passages from Robinson, he makes Mr. Verdeman volunteer his consent to my enjoying this liberty. This was because Mr. Campbell had published that the Pedobaptist moderator at Mount Pleasant, had tried to deprive him of the privilege of reading the same author. After accusing the Pedobaptist in one debate, (though falsely as some say) of this illiberality, he did not like to expose Mr. Verdeman's real guilt in another debate.

In connexion with this subject, he mentions the complaint made by Mr. Verdeman, and (he ought to have said) by Mr. Campbell, that I transgressed the rules of decorum in styling Mr. Campbell our *Accuser* and *Adversary*. He professes to give the words or the purport of the speeches of the three moderators. The man whowould,under oath, give the statements found in the 62d and 63d pages of his book on this subject, would,be grossly deficient invery desirable qualities. He does not report Mr. Burch, the Pedobaptist moderator, to *justify* me in the use of the words complained of, but only to say "something intended as an *excuse* for Mr. M'Calla." As for Mr. Verdeman, the Baptist moderator, and Major Roper, the presiding moderator, he represents them as giving an opinion against me, and then represents me as approving of this adverse decision of the president. By this he evidently designs to make the reader believe that a majority of the bench did, by a definitive decision, deprive me of the right of using these words, and that I relinquished the use of them because I acquiesced in their decision. Mr. Campbell's challenge, which was the well-known subject of debate, read as follows, viz: "I engage to prove, in a debate with him [that is, any Pedobaptist minister,] that Infant Sprinkling is a human tradition, and injurious to the well-being of society, religious and political." Among the particulars which he adduced to shew that our religion was injurious to society, we find such as innovation and corruption, will-worship and superstition, deception and imposition, tyranny and persecution. I insisted that these accusations constituted their author an Accuser, and that he was our Adversary in proportion to our innocence and the heinousness of the crimes alledged. In this I was *justified* and not *excused* by Mr. Burch, the Pedobaptist moderator, and my right to the use of these words was secured to me by the casting vote of Major Roper, the presiding moderator, whose speech on this point of order very ably supported his vote. And how could a man of his character and standing, be expected to decide otherwise? With uncommon reputation, he has served his country as a lawyer, a legislator and a judge. Could he deny that one who makes such conspicuous opposition to the Pedobaptist world, is their adver-

sary ? or that one who volunteers such malignant accusations, is their accuser ? After his decision was announced, and I had expressed my hearty approbation of it, I told the audience that this was the very end for which I had used the words. Before we met, I had suspected Mr. Campbell's design of ungenerously throwing the odium of challenging and accusing upon myself. I therefore determined to use these words in perfect consistency with truth and decorum, until Mr. Campbell should complain, and elicit an authoritative decision in my favour. The thing had proceeded and issued according to my expectations and desires. They could now see in the light of a decision of the bench, who was the assailant, and who stood on the defensive. I then observed, that as the end was accomplished forwhich I had used the offensive words, I should not designedly use them again.

There is reason to believe that the character of Mr. Campbell's speeches was, in some measure, owing to an impression that I was a Kentuckian in temper as well as birth and education. He thought that to irritate, would be a summary method of defeating me. It is probably for this reason, in part, that he is said to have assured his friends that the debate should not occupy more than three hours : for this appeared a sufficient length of time to make me bite myself like an infuriated rattle-snake of our woods. The spirit and word of God had convinced me of my nature and my danger. I prayed in the name of Him who bruises the Serpent's head, and heals the Serpent's bite. Notwithstanding his proud, boastful and abusive language, I occupied the first day in nothing but argument, as if I had not heard his taunts and sarcasms. Early the next morning, several brethren told me that as his scurrility was relished by many, it was highly important that I should notice it ; especially as some, particularly Baptists and strangers, might interpret my calmness into stupid tameness, or cowering fear. "Now, brother M'Calla," says one of them, "I know very well that when you think proper, you can clothe your tongue with a sufficient portion of severity." That day Mr. Campbell shewed considerable uneasiness, and betrayed a great anxiety to bring the controversy to a close as soon as possible, lest the length of the debate and the greatness of his honor, might be in an inverse ratio, the longer the less. The difficulty with him was to find out a way of crying "ENOUGH," and yet gaining the reputation of a triumph. But try it he must, and that very soon ; for the longer it continued, the worse his affairs became. He therefore collected his scattered forces to a point ; boasted much of his success ; formally and very pompously too, proclaimed himself the victor ; and then with a bold and dictatorial air, pronounced the discussion at an end. This artifice appeared perfectly nugatory in the stage which the debate had then attained It only made his weakness conspicuous. This he soon discovered, and as his last resort, he fled to the Moderators to protect him from my arguments ; calling upon them to interpose their authority, to prevent me from taking my own course in the debate, and to com-

pel me to follow any method which he might choose to pursue. His reason for this liberal request was, that he had opened in the affirmative, and that I had followed in the negative, and was therefore (strange to tell) bound to follow him in method and argument as well as in time! In this he was remarkable, alike for generosity and consistency. Was it not generous for him to ask the Moderators to hold his Antagonist until he beat him? And was it not consistent for him to give as a reason for this, a fact which he perseveringly denied in his correspondence with me? that is, that he held the affirmative and I the negative? To obtain the closing speech, he insisted, before the debate, that he held the negative. To stop my head-way during the debate, he insisted that he held the affirmative.

Mr. Campbell's book tells us that Mr. Verdeman's opinion on this point of order, was given "after a number of remarks and "references, which we are sorry cannot be correctly stated, as "there were no minutes taken of the speeches of the Modera-"tors on such occasions." To give weight to these "remarks and references" of Jeremiah Verdeman, as the Baptists of Kentucky call him, Mr. Campbell calls him Bishop Verdeman, leaving the reader to conjecture whether he is the learned Bishop of Kentucky or of the western country at large. Considering his knowledge of deliberative bodies in church and state, both from his own observation and his acquaintance with books, how can the scribes answer to the public for neglecting to record these said "remarks and references" of his? We can easily spare the speeches of the other two Moderators, as they differed from the bishop, and especially as Mr. Campbell gives them no credit for such "a number of" these pillars and ornaments of eloquence. The manner in which this impartial reporter introduces the decision of the Pedobaptist Moderator, presents to advantage the great superiority of his favourite Mr. Verdeman. It is as follows: "The rev. *Birch* [his name is Burch] replied to the bishop," &c. This Mr. Burch, whose friends would be very sorry to rank him with such Bishops as Mr. Verdeman, or such Archbishops as Mr. Campbell, has since declared in public, if I be rightly informed, that Mr. Campbell's report is a tissue of falsehoods. In the particular decision now under review, he has not given a true account of his speech nor that of Major Roper, nor even that of the Baptist Moderator. As for Mr. Verdeman's numerous *references* of which Mr. Campbell speaks, they must have been made at home if they were ever made at all; and his few and confused remarks were a weak echo of Mr. Campbell's attempt to prove that I ought to be required to follow my opponent's method instead of my own. This puerile effort at usurpation and tyranny, was so preposterous, that I said little or nothing upon the subject, especially as I knew the character of the Bench. Accordingly Mr. Burch and Major Roper overruled Mr. Campbell's motion, and supported their decision in their respective addresses, with great calmness, dignity and ability. Shortly after this, Mr. Campbell wished an adjournment, while

the sun was yet high, and gave as a reason for it, that he was sick. I ventured to request that we might continue longer. Mr. Verdeman said that if their chairs were as hard to them as his was to him, they would think that the debate had lasted long enough that day. The Bench very peremptorily decided that the sickness of one of the parties, was a sufficient reason for an adjournment even at that early hour, whether the other party agreed to it or not. There was a sharpness in Major Roper's manner which appeared to charge my request with want of delicacy. I felt the reproof, and acquiesced in the decision. This day's work strongly reminded Col. Morris of the remark which I had made to him about the last speech ; that when my Antagonist began to switch his tail, I was willing to leave him the field. He therefore came up to the stage after the adjournment and asked very gravely, in a low tone, " Don't you think he's beginning to switch his tail ?" Mr. Campbell probably heard that many others viewed his sudden indisposition in the same light : and their suspicions are doubtless strengthened by his indirectly denying in the preface of his book (a) that he was really taken sick on that or any other day of the debate. His words are as follows : " I had reason of grateful thanksgiving for the improvement of my health, during the seven days of the debate."

The next day was Mr. Campbell's strongest day of the seven, and shewed him to be what a lawyer in the neighbourhood called him, " a very considerable man." From the morning until he closed the discussion in the evening, he was thought to have the windward of me. But the very reverse was the general impression concerning Saturday, the next day: and so completely was the former ground regained in my closing speech that evening, that Mr. Verdeman, like a losing gamester, could not consent to procrastinate until Monday, an opportunity of making reprisals. He obstinately insisted that the debate should continue during the Sabbath. In this he failed, and his champion failed in ever again obtaining any advantage. On Tuesday evening it was rumoured that Major Roper could not attend longer than Wednesday. I was advised to calculate upon this. During the six days that were past, I had sometimes had to abridge the matter of my notes, but in general, I had produced palpable proof for every assertion. If this plan had been rigidly pursued on the last day, I should probably have left the latter part of the challenge and perhaps half of Mr. Campbell's speeches wholly untouched. I was obliged to adopt more of a declamatory method, in which facts were rapidly strung together with general references to evidence, without quotations or extracts. This gave a more popular air to the defence of that day than perhaps any other, and it was evident that as the house of David waxed stronger and stronger, that of Saul waxed weaker and weaker. After my recapitulation, I went to packing my books in the trunk, calculating that if Mr. Campbell had reserved any thing for the

(a) Page XI.

last blow, he would give it then, when I appeared to be done. I was not disappointed. Such palpable violations of truth as he then gave, required an answer. I arose as usual, to occupy my half hour, according to our agreement and our previous practice. Mr. Campbell forbade me to speak, and appealed to the Bench to stop me and secure to him the closing speech. After consulting the written rules, Major Roper announced it as their decision, that I had a right to proceed. He also informed us that he was now willing to remain there, if we requested it, until Saturday night. I answered that, during life, I should love him that for declaration. This, however, was the least of Mr. Campbell's wishes: and lest an adjournment to the next day should really take place, he made short work of the matter, by closing the debate with the following speech, viz: "Mr. M'Calla is the most perverse mortal that I ever had any thing to do with." These are the words, and all of the words of his last speech, according to my recollection; and as they did not seem to need an answer, I gave him the full benefit of his closing speech, according to my declaration to Col. Morris. Yet you need not expect to find this speech nor these facts in his printed report. There he gives you a few lines of his own invention, for my last speech, which would occupy several pages, and he gives twice as much for his last speech, without once recording the sentence and the only sentence which really constituted his last speech. And what is more remarkable still, he represents me as trying to secure the closing speech, and applying to the Bench to prevent him from replying, and observes that "the Presiding Moderator read the rules and "declared that I [Mr. Campbell] had a right to reply, if I [Mr. Campbell] thought it necessary" !!! From Mr. Campbell's invincible disposition to exchange his faults for his Antagonist's virtues, and *vice versa*, I cannot help thinking, (and I hope that it is not uncharitable to think) that he has some Egyptian blood in him: for this is the very way in which Potiphar's wife treated Joseph. She charged him with the crime of which she was guilty, and claimed to herself the virtue which he possessed.

The name of this Patriarch again reminds me, my dear Uncle, of your name and that of your Baptist son, who I hope is in heaven. May this be your happy portion, after your revolutionary frame of more than four score years, is laid in the dust. Should we not pray also that this may be the truly glorious destiny of the friend of our country, General la Fayette, with whom your letter informs me you had the pleasure of dining in that county which bears his name, and in which I was born and brought up.

Ever yours affectionately,

W. L. M'CALLA.

Glasgow Forge, 37 miles from Philad. Aug. 9, 1826.

No. 14.

On the truth and genuineness of Mr. Campbell's Report.

From W. L. M'Calla to the Rev. John R. Moreland, near Cynthiana, (Ky.)

My Dear Brother———Whether Mr. Campbell's opinion of my character be true or not, your fraternal esteem and affection must be evident to any one who knows that your first son was M'Calla Moreland. A long residence together under my father's roof, formed a christian attachment between us, in which my heart has ever rejoiced. Through grace, I have never yet been ashamed of the solemn covenant which we formed and renewed with God and with one another, that we would, by the help of his Spirit, devote ourselves to his faithful service, in the face of all the toil, disgrace and suffering which attend such a life. I have not yet forgotten the conspicuous instrumentality which you had, in company with Father Lyle and Brothers Martin and Rankin, in my licensure, ordination and installation; nor the peculiar participation which you and I afterward had, in each other's dangers and troubles, in the good and glorious, though traduced and insulted cause of our Divine Redeemer.

Your letter and the letters of many others, urge me strongly to publish as soon as possible, my Discussion of Baptism. Delay, occasioned by Pastoral duties, you will justify; and constant sickness will call for sympathy rather than censure. Add to this that my circumstances require leisure and deliberation, as well as faith and prayer, on account of the wiles of the adversary with whom I have to contend. With this you are in some measure acquainted, as it was you who informed me of the artifice used for obtaining subscribers for his book in your congregation, by the holders of the papers telling them that it was authorized by both parties. You told me that justice to your people and to the community, required me to notice this fraud. I did so in the Kentucky Gazette; and at the same time expressed an opinion that Mr. Campbell, from the want of both the means and the disposition, was not quite so well qualified to write my speeches as I was myself. The want of disposition appeared from very numerous, and sometimes very gross misstatements of my words and sentiments during the debate. In this treatment I was far from being the only sufferer. I read some pertinent remarks of Dr. Mason's, on a certain point. Mr. Campbell answered by popular declamation and personal slander. He endeavoured to persuade the audience that the Dr. considered infant baptism not as a divine institution, but a money-making scheme to aggrandize the clergy. Basing our system of a mixed church upon divine authority, Dr. Mason had spoken of its happy effects upon the resources, numbers, and safety of the church. In the 216th page of Mr. Campbell's book, he openly declares that he called this "Dr. Mason's *grand reason* for advocating a mixed church;" thus assigning to the Dr. as a cause, what he had given as favourable providential effects of that which was caused

by the authority and power of God. I observed that the sentiment of the passage thus perverted, was simply this, that irreligious men helped the pious by their money and their protection. This I observed was the sentiment of an inspired prophecy also, which says that "the earth helped the woman." Mr. Campbell's answer in the above-mentioned page, pretends that in this remark I advocated the alledged scheme of money-making as the *grand reason* for our system, and justified Dr. Mason's assertion to this effect, from the consideration that this humanly devised method of raising money, was a fulfilment of prophecy !!!

Another perversion of words and actions which took place during the debate, Mr. Campbell has substantially recorded in page 366, in the following words, viz : "I wish it to be noted that "Mr. M'Calla has quoted the most of his Paido-baptist author-"ities from my debate in Ohio, and acknowledged that in eve-"ry instance they are correctly given in that volume." In answer to this I told him that for particular reasons, I had quoted a few, but not most of my Pedobaptist authorities from his book. And that, so far from acknowledging that, in every instance, they were correctly given in that volume, the context of some of the passages read was incorrect, and that I meant to shew in its proper place, that he was grossly dishonest in his quotations. In the progress of the debate, I did shew, as I hope to shew in print, this gross dishonesty of his. Yet he has recorded his false assertion concerning my opinion of his book, and to give it credibility, he has left it unanswered and unrefuted, by my immediate reply, and my subsequent exposures.

In No. 13, above, I gave an instance in which his book claimed my words and actions to himself, and attributed his words and actions to me. In page 66, he has recorded a similar error in one of his speeeches. His words are the following, viz : "Why did he contend with me so long in his correspondence, on the necessity af my opening the debate ?" Now here is a case which may be tested by the evidence of record. Let any one examine our correspondence as incorrectly published by him, or as fairly published by me, and then say whether I ever once contended with him on the necessity of his opening the debate, or whether it was not Mr. Campbell who pertinaciously contended for the necessity of my opening ; thinking thereby to secure the close to himself, When this point was lost, and both were left at liberty to speak until satisfied, Mr. Campbell opened of choice, and not of compulsion ; for although I preferred his opening, I told him that his wish should be my rule on that subject ; he might direct which of us should perform that duty. He accordingly undertook this task himself ; and it appears, from his subsequent conduct, that he was determined to make this answer a more important end than the closing speech could, by pleading that it gave him a right to dictate the course which his Antagonist should take !! How I should hate to advocate a cause which needs such Machiavellian twisting and pinching and screwing to carry it through !

Take a third fact, in which Mr. Campbell has surreptitiously changed places with his Antagonist. He was always anxious for me to admit that sprinkling or pouring was only a figurative baptism and not a literal baptism: whereas I always insisted that they were literal, and gave, to prove my point, such instances as the baptism in the cloud and in the sea, where there was not even a partial immersion, but sprinkling only. If Mr. Campbell had fairly stated and correctly copied my words and sentiments, he would have been poorly paid for his labour. As an indemnification, therefore for his disinterested benevolence, in speaking and writing for us both, he takes the liberty of putting into my mouth that doctrine which I rejected. In what he professes to be his own speech, in page 301, this misrepresentation is found in the following words, viz: "Like Dr. Rallston, he [M'Calla] argues "that the word *baptizo* and *baptismos* 'are not used in a literal "but figurative sense' in relation to baptism." This was to pave the way for the splendid triumph which he has celebrated in pages 352, 353. The following are his words, viz: "And has it "all come to this that Mr. M'Calla with Mr. Rallston and others, "can only *argue the figurative meaning of BAPTIZO against* "*the literal:* that '*the writers of the New Testament use it in a* "*figurative sense!!*' [Let this be sung, *doloroso* ed *affetuoso.*] "Unparalleled circumstance! The only occurrence since Rev- "elation began that the word which enjoins a religious action is "to be taken figuratively!!" [The next should be sung *allegro* ed *con-spirito.*] "Happy result! nothing can be decided from "Greek but that *baptizo* is used *figuratively*, not literally in "the New Testament!' What a *dolorous* and *affecting*, and yet what a *brisk* and *spirited* display of eloquence would the world have lost, if Mr. Campbell had, in this instance, confined himself too strictly to the truth, after the obsolete fashion of the Pedobaptist Puritans of old! Few such specimens of the sublime can be found in their buckram productions. Their writings, however, had one advantage, that they could bear examination; a durable quality, in which it is to be feared that Mr. Campbell's book is deficient. In page 303, Mr Campbell says that in relation to the baptism of the Holy Spirit, "The word is used figuratively," and I am guilty of agreeing with him. I said moreover, that in Coll. 2d, and in Rom. 6th, the Apostle speaks of a spiritual baptism, because he connects it with a spiritual circumcision and planting or engrafting, and with a spiritual crucifixion and death and burial. Yet I never did say, as Mr. Campbell has atributed to me, that "*Baptizo* and *Baptismos* are not used in a "literal but figurative sense in relation to baptism." I never did say "that the writers of the New Testament use it in a figurative sense" "only" But, as Mr. Campbell well knows, I have said and proved the contrary of this, in the discussion of passages, where he made a dolorous and affecting retreat to that very *figurative baptism*, against which he here makes such a brisk and spirited outcry. In page 271, he makes no less than five assertions of the figurative use of baptism: and in page 302, the very next to the one in which he first charges me with this

crime, he insists that the baptism of the Israelites in the cloud and in the sea "was a figure only."

Misrepresentations, such as the above were made so frequently in my presence, and in the presence of a large audience, that Mr. Campbell's character stands much higher for boldness than for veracity. A hearer of high standing, who makes no pretentions to religion, and who was unfriendly to me before the debate, said, during its progress, (as I was credibly informed,) that he now believed the report of Mr. Campbell's rejecting the revealed law: for he had, in his hearing, thrown contempt upon all of the ten commandments; especiallly that one which says, *thou shalt not*————He had not committed the commandments to memory, and therefore gave the substance of the ninth, in four very plain monosyllables. Knowing that my opponent's acquaintance with this *Cretan* accomplishment was far superior to his knowledge of the Alexandrian Version, of which he boasts so much, I ventured to inform the public, as mentioned above, that I did not think him qualified to write for both parties. This occasioned the following words in Mr. Campbell's Preface; viz: "Mr. "M'Calla, dreading the appearance of this discussion in print, "very injudiciously begins to condemn it before it appeared: for "having prejudged and condemned it before it appeared, he has "shown his determination to deny it when it does appear, and "has thus deprived his testimony of that character essential to "credibility and authority."

You recollect at whose instance, and for what reason, I put that notice into the paper. Many Pedobaptists had been told that I had a hand in the book. Justice to them required that the fraud should be exposed. When this was done, I was so far from fearing its appearance, that I rejoiced in the prospect: and I have rejoiced ever since I read it. But its author took care that I should not enjoy this privilege very soon. Early in May 1824, I passed through his neighborhood, on my way to this place, as a delegate to the General Assembly. He knew that I wished an opportunity of answering his book in Philadelphia. It was in his power to give me a copy. Hearing that it was just through the press, I sent a request for the sheets, by one of the most respectable of his fellow-citizens, promising not to show it to any one until such a period as he would allow could not interfere with his interest in the sale of his work. Regardless of entreaties, he refused. You now see his reason for saying that I was afraid to see his book. The truth is, he was afraid to see mine; and you know he is in the habit of charging me with his faults.

On arriving in Philadelphia, I found just such a fowl as Mr. Campbell, perched within a few steps of where I now live; and crowing defiances to the whole world, much in the style of my former opponent. The assembly soon adjourned. I visited friends in New-Jersey and New-York, and returned. As no

copy of Mr. Campbell's book had yet arrived, although I had earnestly requested that a copy might be sent as soon as possible, I accepted the proud challenge of this new adversary, a Unitarian Universalist. He also soon had a book that he thought I was afraid to see: and in the next December, while I was engaged in answering his book, (an answer not completed till the following April,) I got the first sight of Mr. Campbell's Report. And now that I have got it, he seems to think that I need not answer it, because I prejudged it, as he says, and as my Universalist neighbour also said about his book. In both cases, I was guilty of telling the people that I had no hand in the book: and in both cases I was so unruly as to insinuate that I did not like the character of my Antagonist quite well enough, to subscribe every forgery which they chose to write in my name. This is, in their eyes, sufficient to destroy my credibility when writing for myself: and on reflection, I confess that it should stamp a man's character for falsehood and corruption, as readily as an act of *scandalum magnatum* against the Pope or the Devil should convict him of heresy or impiety.

In Mr. Lowry's evidence, given at the close of the Preface to this volume, he says with perfect truth, that Mr. Campbell's account of the debate "is *essentially* incorrect, as to the *matter* "and *manner*, both of *Mr. M'Calla's* speeches and *his own*." With regard to his own, this is evident from his substituting a speech of his best polish for the single pitiful sentence with which he closed the debate. Yet on this subject his Preface uses the following language; viz: "The style adopted in the following speech-"es, is, we believe, little or nothing better than that in which "they appeared upon the stage. On my part they were extempo-"raneous, as all my public addresses are; and therefore the "style is of the familiar and diffuse character, such as might be "expected from a person who did not know till the evening be-"fore the discussion, whether he was to open the debate or to re-"spond; whether he or his opponent was to introduce the mat-"ter to be discussed." Although I do not very much admire the style even of his written composition, yet all who compare it with his real speeches will give it the preference. Take for instance, his last speech, which he had fondly hoped would be a triumphant topping-off of the controversy. "Mr. M'Calla is the "most perverse mortal that I ever had any thing to do with." Though we cannot admit that the style of so short an address is very "*diffuse*," yet we can agree with its author, that it is very "*familiar*." We can agree also that it was *extemporaneous*, as all his public addresses were; and as he had no previous acquaintance with thematter which elicited this sally of eloquence too big to be recorded, so we agree with him lastly, that he did not, before the debate commenced know what sort of a close it would come to. It is somewhat remarkable, however, that he should so anxiously persuade the public that he has given a fair report of his speeches which he confesses were extemporaneous, and which were not recorded by any stenographer. His vanity has disclos-

ed evidence which his avarice would, otherwise have conceal-ed.

As his own book proves the impossibility of his copying his own speeches, would you suppose that the same volume gives evidence, that in this respect I have the advantage of him beyond all comparison. That volume from beginning to end, proves that I have abundant means for writing my own argument, and for correcting his false report of my argument. Here I will not resort to the sophism of his preface, which pretends that his report must be correct, because it contains the topics presented in my letters; as if the mere existence of a text was sufficient to authenticate the commentary. But in this same preface, Mr. Campbell pretends to rejoice that I had preached in Lexington, from the same notes used in the debate, "because," says he, "we have no doubt, but, in so doing, he has been obtaining for "this work additional evidences of its correctness." He says that he has given my speeches correctly;———But if their character is enhanced by my addresses in Lexington, my addresses there must have been correct too;———And if, as he thus admits, there is "no doubt" that my notes would enable me to repeat in Lexington, speeches originally delivered in Washington, will they not as well enable me to repeat or write them here, and to compare them with the speeches which he has forged for me?

My wish was to curtail the debate, by confining it, as much as possible, to the scriptures: yet I endeavoured laboriously to make previous preparation on every point which my opponent could touch. A friend or two enquired of me before hand, how long a time I supposed the debate would occupy. The answer was, that I could not tell. I should rejoice if it could terminate in two or three days: but if my Antagonist took a certain course, the matter which I had prepared, might probably occupy eight days. My opponent did take this course; and his subsequent lamentations over the unwelcome effects of this course, prove, out of his own mouth, the stability of them aterials now in my hands. In the 71st page, he has recorded the following words, viz: "I "see from the course or method projected by Mr. M'Calla, that "the information I had a day or two ago, concerning the quantity "of matter he had prepared for this debate was correct. I heard "from a respectable source, that my opponent boasted that he "had 'eight days matter prepared,' that the discussion of his "matter would require eight days! Indeed, soon as I heard "him read his five propositions, I felt assured that this discus-"sion would be tedious beyond all necessary bounds."

Besides these dreadful notes, I brought a trunk of books to the ground. In the conclusion of No. 12 above, it is mentioned that many of these were brought at the express request of Mr. Campbell's friend and representative, for his use. Instead of a polite acknowledgment of this attention, this detector of ungentlemanly conduct endeavoured to make his wit bear upon the mere fact of bringing a trunk of books to the stage of debate.

Without reproaching him for ingratitude, I met him single handed with his own weapons. I am much mistaken if he did not wish that he had left this subject untouched. As an evidence of this, he has suppressed it in his report; and instead of this, he has, in the very same book, endeavoured to place Mr. Walker in the ridiculous attitude in which I placed him, and for the very same reason. In page 417, he introduces Mr. Walker as saying in his subsequent publication, "His, [Mr. Campbell's] "library, when carried to the stage in pomp, presented nearly a "cart load of books." Mr. Campbell then says. "Avery small "part of my library was carried to the stage, but it appears Mr. "Walker has not got over the panick yet; for he repeatedly "talks of that 'vast pile of Greek, and huge dictionaries ferried "over the sea.'" If Mr. Campbell had given us a true copy of his extemporaneous addresses, in his "style" "of the familiar and diffuse character," of which his Preface speaks with such graceful self-complacency, we should have had much more unequivocal evidences of *bibliophobia* at Washington than at Mount Pleasant. We should also have had more redundant evidence from his pen as well as his lips, to my means of correcting his report, and of writing for myself.

But of this there is enough even in his present report, garbled as it is. In page 173, he says that his antagonist "projected this easy course of reading and commenting on the gleanings of his leisure hours." These gleanings are still in my hands, and it is as easy for me to read them and comment on them now as then. In page 113, his remarks are too long to insert here, though they must not be permitted to perish. This handsome exhibition of clerical meekness and gentleness shall be given to the Baptist disputant in No. 19 of these collateral papers, as one of his speeches. The substance of it, however, is this: Instead of comparing Mr. M'Calla, and his laborious preparations, with Mr. Campbell and his invincible talents, he brings a boy of sixteen years of age into contrast with the Archbishop of Canterbury; a Prelate, whose tittle would please his taste much better than that of the Archbishop of Buffaloe Creek; and whose honours and emoluments might possibly rescue him from the degrading occupation of publishing spurious books, a trade not a whit more honourable, in a moral point of view, than that of a *dreadful-accident maker* to a newspaper. In order to prepare the minds of the people for witnessing with compassion the fall of a great man, a catastrophe, which he seemed to think might not be very distant, he told them that circumstances might exist, in which this ignorant lad of sixteen might hold an indefinitely protracted, and even at last, a successful dispute with his learned Lordship of Canterbury. The only reason which he assigns for this supposed phenomenon, as yet unheard of in the polemical world, is that Mr. Campbell should be permitted to place in the hands of this boy, such written preparations as I had in my hands. This was as much as to say to the audience, "When you see me tottering and reeling and falling, give me

an interest in your sympathy and respect, for my fate will be owing not to any want of genius, or information, or skill, (for in these respects I have an Archiepiscopal superiority,) but it will be owing solely to the inequality of our weapons: I had more truth and talents, but alas! my Antagonist had more paper and ink!!" In answer to Mr. Campbell's truly original argument on this subject, I would ask him the following question. If writing for one of the parties, and that an illiterate boy, would *probably* gain the victory, is it not safer to write for both, and thus *make sure* of it? This plan he has adopted; and it will ultimately appear as fraught with wisdom as the scheme of the man who was not satisfied with saving half his winter's wood by getting one stove, but he must get two, and thus save the whole of it.

But we proceed to quote a few other passages from his own book, to shew that while he is dealing in stoves, I have all the fuel. In page 146, he introduces my half hour as a term of reading instead of declaiming. "Mr M'Calla *read* as follows." In page 87, he closes his half hour by saying, "But I shall give place to him to *read* farther on his Jewish Church." In page 156, he says, "Mr. M'Calla again resumed his *notes*." In page 82, he says, "I complained in my last address that Mr. M'Calla *read* his arguments from his manuscript, and neglected to respond to mine." Instead of calling this an occasional reading, he terms it in the same page "a *constant* attention to this little book."

Repeated observation has taught me that my little books are of a different description from the little book mentioned in Rev. X. 9. Howsoever bitter that was after being swallowed, it was sweet in the mouth of him to whom it was administered: but a little book of mine is bitter as soon as a person tastes it. It produced the very same wry faces in my Universalist patient that it did with Mr. Campbell. What a remarkable resemblance there is between the effects produced by two different potions, upon two different subjects of disease, at the distance of six hundred miles from each other, will appear to persons not present, by their expressions of loathing which are recorded by themselves. The Universalist uses the following language, viz: "My opponent has once more turned to his little book." "It "appears to me, and I think it must also appear to you, that my "opponent had not only the out lines, but the very body of his "argument prepared before he came to the controversy; for he "is going straight on in his long story, without taking notice of "aught I say." "He has his mind marked out in a particular "track; for having anticipated, as he supposed, the ground "which would be occupied by his opponent, he had his matter "ready cut and dried to meet him." "While I am speaking he "is reading his little book, without attending to the arguments I "may offer against his doctrine." Compare these Universalist groans with those which have been given of Mr. Campbell's, or with the following in page 67. "Is it possible that he is going

"to read all the time out of this manuscript he has in his hand; "that he has all his arguments written down, and will not aban- "don the course he has prescribed to himself! So then he de- "bates with the *pen*, and I *viva voce*, or rather he reads his ar- "guments, and *dares* not attack mine." And lastly, in page 386, he says,——"He [M'Calla] wrote down at home all that he "has advanced as argument in this discussion; and knowing "that he had all that he could or would say in writing, he at the "same time, insisted that I should open the debate, whereas he "was determined to keep to his notes, let me take what course "I might."

Although the above extracts are far from telling the truth in some particulars, yet they certainly testify in the strongest manner, the fulness and the accuracy of the means which I possess for writing my own argument, and for exposing his report. They moreover show, in a strong light, the prevarication of the following passage in his Preface; viz: "Mr, M'Calla rather holds "out the idea in these words, [in the Kentucky Gazette,] that he "has as many notes, or the same means as those which I possess. "Yet he [Mr. M'Calla] took no notes himself," &c. The force of this passage may be estimated by remembering, that in the Kentucky Gazette, I expressed no wish, and claimed no qualifications, to write for Mr. Campbell, but only for myself. My possessing the means of writing for myself more fully and correctly than he could write for me, is then, the position which the above remark was intended to refute. He knows that the notes written before the debate, and used in the debate, are those which were contemplated by me in the Kentucky Gazette. These therefore are the notes, the existence of which he indirectly denies; when he says that I have not "as many notes" as himself, nor "the same means as those which" he possesses. Whether this sly insinuation, (as guilty as the most direct affirmation of falsehood,) be not flatly contradicted by the above extracts from his own speeches, even according to his own unfair report, you can easily judge, by remembering, that he represents me as being able to repeat my argument in Lexington from notes used in the debate;——that he declares his belief of the rumour that I had eight days' matter prepared;——that he represents his Antagonist as taking "the easy course of reading and commenting on the gleanings of his leisure hours;"——a method by which Mr. Campbell could enable a boy of sixteen to overcome the Arch Bishop of Canterbury;——that he closes his thirty minutes by giving way to my reading, and introduces my turn as a period of reading, not speaking;——that he expressly says that "Mr. M'Calla read his arguments from his manuscript," and gave "a *constant* attention to this little book:" Oh! bitter, bitter!!—— that he declares that his opponent "has all his arguments written down," that "he debates with the pen," that "he reads his arguments," that "he wrote at home ALL that he has advanced as argument in this discusion." that "he had ALL that he could or would say in writing, "and" was determined to keep to his notes."

The man who can make these statements, and then deny that I am as well furnished with notes as he is, must be a Unitarian. I am glad that he is not a Pedobaptist. Mr. Brewster of New-York, and the Editors of the Columbian Star are welcome to him, and to his Episcopal moderator whom you defeated in Paris: for I have not yet forgotten that you made the floor feel as hard to his feet on that occasion, as the chair felt to his seat when Mr. Campbell fell so suddenly sick, in a debate, in which, (strange to tell!) his health improved from first to last. Neither have I forgotten that you also were guilty of preparing a little book, in defence of our blessed Lord's eternal Deity, in consequence of a challenge received from Mr. Campbell's Baptist brother, the great New-light Unitarian, from which challenge, however, he receded in my presence. May God enable you ever to act with the pious fidelity and manly firmness displayed on those occasions.

Yours affectionately,

W. L. M'CALLA.

No. 15.

The Campbellisms, transpositions, supplements, interpolations, suppressions and alterations of Mr. Campbell's Report.

From W. L. M'Calla to the Rev. Archibald Cameron, near Shelbyville, Ky.

Dear Brother———Your very name reminds me of a fact, which you doubtless rejoice to hear, that materials are now collecting in Scotland for writing the history of your countrymen, the Cameronians. Through Jesus Christ, I glory in the thought that the vile novels of the basest slanderer on earth have been the means of bringing once more, fully before the public eye, the character of the martyrs. The Devil is now trying to finish with the pen of Walter Scott, what the sword of Claverhouse left undone. His defeat is likely to be as conspicuous now as then.

But your letter to me brings into view, a slanderous novel of an enemy nearer home. You seem to grumble at the price which Mr. Campbell has asked for his fictions: yet if you knew how exquisitely fabulous they are, you would be still more astonished at that disinterested benevolence which could ask six thousand Dollars for one edition of such commodities, besides something for the copy-right. I would not, for all the dollars that he ever made, endure the labour of exposing every falsehood of his book. It would be almost as interminable and unprofitable as making war upon the musquitoes of Louisiana. But as you did not witness the conference, you will have patience to examine a few specimens of different descriptions in the following order.

1. *Campbellisms.* Mr. Campbell's words and forms of speech have certain characteristics, which if not peculiar to himself, are at least very foreign from his Antagonist: yet with these words and forms, which, for convenience, I call Campbellisms, he has thoughtlessly plaistered his man of straw. It was a fashion of his to call me by name. After dropping the words *adversary* and *accuser*, it was my fashion to call him *my Opponent*, according to Mr. Verdeman's express request. In pages 288, 352, 353, it will be seen that I have to follow suit with him; so that although I did not use this form three times perhaps, in the seven days, he has made me use it six times in the two last pages referred to. For the same reason he has, in page 189, made me talk of the scriptures, as exciting us to a *virtuous* and happy life. This is the language of him and his school: but this milk-and-water style is no more mine than talking of obtaining good fortune from propitious stars. In pages 196, 204, it will be seen that he deals in such words as *formative* and *confirmative:* In pages 191, 192, he gives these words to me. In page 232, he gives me the plural *minutiæ* instead of the singular *minutia.* This I set down at first for a typographical error: but on reading to a note in page 326, I found that "every *minutiæ*" is a Campbellism, notwithstanding his boisterous and contemptuous treatment of Mr. Greatrake for such trifles as these. In pages 173, 184, and in many other passages of his composition, Mr. Campbell himself uses the word *proven.* Many years before the debate, I renounced this word as not English, and used in its place the word *proved* the real past participle of *prove.* Yet in pages 119, 233, he has blistered me with this exploded Campbellism no less than three times, his abuse of Mr. Greatrake for the use of such cantharides notwithstanding. But Mr. Campbell has "proven" that the notes of the bishop of Pittsburgh, and the Archbishop who created him, and the Doctors who assisted him, have made me speak exactly like my Opponent. If these gentlemen have really the art of making men of such opposite sentiments and habits speak exactly alike, in "every *minutiæ*," would it not be well to get them to attend your synod? They are certainly needed in the General Assembly.

2. *Transpositions.* This is one of the most important arts of a Reporter, who wishes to make money by writing for himself and his opponent too. If, in the debate, his own argument should fail him, like a broken tooth or a foot out of joint, this process, like the surgeon's art, will enable him to adjust the dislocation in the absense of the enemy, and thus to set his argument once more upon its legs. This plan of concentrating in a report, arguments which were scattered in the debate, Mr. Campbell acknowledges in a note, page 220, under the pretext of its promoting brevity. But as he has transposed *his* arguments for the purpose of strengthening them by a better *arrangement*, so has he more abundantly shifted *my* arguments and responses, for the purpose of weakening them by *derangement.* Of the many instances now before my eyes, I shall give you one or two samples. In

consequence of my brethren recommending to me a greater portion of severity than I had shown on the first day, Mr. Campbell became exceedingly unhappy on the second day. A part of those remarks which exposed him to the ridicule which he desired so much to bring upon his Antagonist, he has pretended to record in page 137, during the second day in the woods, the correct time and place. Others of these remarks he has detached to page 167, in the third day, after the weather had driven us from the forest to the Baptist meeting-house in town, at which time and place they were not made. In both cases my remarks are silly in themselves and inapplicable to what he has said, in consequence of artful alterations made both in his speeches and mine.

As observed before, it will not quit cost to give many particulars; but I would in general terms give another specimen of transposition. A remark of his own which he has suppressed in page 204, he has transferred to me by anticipation, in page 200: and my answer which immediately followed this remark of his, he has detached to page 233, as some parents send their children to a distant school, to keep them from doing mischief at home. In this as in other passages, he has made such alterations and confusions in his speeches and mine, as are altogether too numerous and too contemptible to deserve correction.

3. *Supplements.* Although Mr. Campbell would not like to have his argument supplanted by the voluminous irrelevant context of a few references, yet he scruples not to substitute such compilations for my speeches, and then to sell them as my composition. Perhaps he thought this necessary to prove his assertion that my addresses were reading instead of speaking. In a note page 92, he gives us the following notice, viz: "Not having minuted the precise number of verses read in each reference, we have, in order to give full satisfaction, given *the whole of each reference!!*" As an instance of his disinterested generosity in thus filling up my few minutes with good things, he has in page 170, given me a half *a page* of scripture instead of *half a line* which I quoted. This plan he follows in quoting uninspired writers also. Instead of *eight lines* which I quoted from Dr. Mason, he has in page 210, and following, given me the benefit of *three pages.* If you suppose that for this supplementary matter, he allows me additional space in his book, you are much mistaken; for the above passages are in such short addresses, that, if I ever had spoken them at all, (which I certainly never did,) I should have got through them in much less than a quarter of an hour. But all this was done, (to use his own language,) "in order to give full satisfaction." Would it not have given still fuller satisfaction, if he had taken the whole of my speeches out of the scriptures and Dr. Mason's writings, instead of inventing the greater part himself?

4. *Interpolations.* You know that Mr. Campbell published what he called a debate between him and Mr. Walker. There

was nothing in that whole work, which presented his talents as a disputant, in so advantageous a light, as his retort upon the Pedobaptist Moderator, for objecting to his asking questions. [a] Yet in the 237th page of Mr. Walker's publication, it appears that this ready and exquisite retort was not spoken at the debate, but was interpolated in the Report; and although it was the fruit of subsequent excogitation, Mr. Campbell expressly stated that it was uttered by him on the spot, in immediate reply to the Moderator. If he has interpolated the whole of his last speech against me, and much other matter, perhaps he thinks I have no right to complain, as he has tried his talents so liberally in my speeches also. At this moment I see a text in page 147, which is not in my notes, and which every one will see ought not to be there. In page 307, he begins a speech for me, of which I never uttered one sentence, and hardly one single sentiment. As he is making me speak of seals in page 190, he inserts the affair of Judah leaving his seal with Tamar. For the same reason, and in the same page, he interpolates a remark upon the sealed duplicates of important Jewish contracts. In the next page he makes me refer to such a volume and such a page of Hanways Travels; a book which I never quoted, and never saw in my life. So in page 141, he makes me give the very words of Mr. Porter's Dissertation on Baptism, in the 24th and 25th pages of that Dissertation; of which author and dissertation, pages and words, I never knew any thing, until I saw them in a speech composed for me by Mr. Campbell.

5. *Suppressions.* Considering the fair promises of Mr. Campbell's prospectus and the unequivocal declaration of Mr. Rigdon's certificate, is it not strange that when I filled up my half hours so industriously, the report should give me no more than 6½ pages for a speech, as in page 316, or no more than 2½, as in page 250, or no more than half a page, as in 372? In a note, in page 356, he professes to give only an *abstract* of what was said. In page 176, he professes to give the *sum* of my remarks; and in page 250, and 243, to give nothing more than a *specimen*; confessing that "other extracts more *lengthy*," [another Campbellism for the philological castigator of Mr. Greatrake,]——confessing that "other extracts more *lengthy*" than those which he reported, were suppressed. When he suppressed the matter of his own speeches as he confesses he did in pages 165, 327, it does not appear to shorten his speeches as it does mine. For doing both, he always had a reason. In a bracketed note, page 155, he tells us why he suppressed both his remarks and mine on a passage in Macknight. His words are the following, viz: "On "the stage we read and commented on the whole passage in Mac- "knight's translation, which is too tedious for insertion here, we "shall give the substance at another time." When this other time occurred I am not able to say. In another instance he quoted and commented upon a passage of the same author in He-

[a] See p. 74.

brews; but as his own weapon was turned against him, the arguments on both sides became so "tedious" that he suppressed them.

During the 3d day Mr. Campbell asserted that Calvin and Beza were the first who taught that baptism was the Christian circumcision. In my next, I requested the audience, to take particular notice of this assertion, as I should afterward, God willing, produce the direct testimony of the early fathers to this point. He endeavoured to screen himself from impending disgrace, by reading to the audience, what he called a very respectable author, in defence of this untenable position. Suspecting that the author was an acquaintance of mine, who could not be bolstered up in his own country, by being called the Bishop of Lexington, I requested his name, and it was given. In page 167, he gives my request that the audience would notice this false assertion of his last speech: but in his last speech he suppresses this false assertion. He entirely suppresses his attempt to prove it by his "respectable author," and he suppresses my evidence of its falsehood, as too long for insertion, as he expresses in page 230.

During his report of the 6th and 7th days, he carries on the work of suppression on a great scale. On an average, he allows to both parties, less than five pages an hour: and as his addresses are always made longer than mine, he very condescendingly allows me at the rate of between one and two pages for every half hour spent in debate during these days.

To *tender consciences* it may appear difficult to reconcile this proceeding with the principles of veracity and honesty. In his Prospectus he promises that "*all* the arguments on *both* sides "shall be *faithfully* and *impartially detailed.*" In his Preface he says, "But now when the work is completed, we can, from "the actual result, fully demonstrate, from the face of the vo- "lume, the justice and propriety of our proposals." In the same Preface he says, "In the following pages there is *detailed* a con- "troversy of seven days." And to prove all this, he publishes Mr. Rigdon's certificate, declaring his report to be "a *fair* and "*full* exhibition of *both* sides of the controversy." It is not necessary to multiply witnesses to see whether these things are true. The face of the report proves the falsehood of Mr. Campbell's promise and of Mr. Rigdon's certificate. Can any one believe that it takes me thirty minutes to deliver the matter contained in two small pages? Will a list of unfaithful abridgments, summaries, specimens and abstracts pass for *all* the arguments in *detail?* Will any one, acquainted with language, say that in these "there "is *detailed* a controversy of seven days?" Will these be considered a *fair* and *full* exhibition of both sides of the controversy? Mr. Campbell knows that it is incredible to those who examine it, and he therefore offers explanations. His Preface reads as follows, viz. "With regard to the length of the speeches on both "sides, it is necessary to inform those who did not hear the de- "bate, that I pronounced more words in a given time than my

"opponent. I think it will be granted, on all sides, that I pro-"nounced as many words in twenty minutes as he did in thirty." In this also he very much resembles my Universalist opponent. On reading his report, people who know the rapidity of my speech, may wonder that his written addresses are longer than mine. On enquiry they find that he arose very slowly, pulled out his watch very deliberately, took as long a time as possible to adjust it on the desk, and at last made frequent complaints of the want of matter to fill up his time. Yet the speeches which he wrote for himself were longer than those which he wrote for me! Mr. Campbell's great volubility was the reason which he gave for writing longer speeches for himself than for Mr. Walker. Yet in the 239th page of Mr. Walker's reply, I find that Mr. Campbell wasted a good deal of his time, in such a way as to try the patience of the assembly, and at last produce an altercation between him and his opponent, whether he was not bound to speak all the time, or whether he had not a right to spend his period in writing, or otherwise, if he chose. A Baptist who was at the debate in Washington, told the people in Lexington that Mr. Campbell had the truth on his side, but that I had appeared to gain the victory because I used the tongue faster than he. And from that day to this I have never known a contrary testimony on this point of rapid speaking, except in Mr. Campbell's book.

Immediately after the above excuse for suppression, he adds the following, viz. "As the topics which we were pledged to "discuss, were chiefly taken up in the first five days, we have "given the arguments of those days in great length, abbreviating "only such matter as had little or no bearing upon the subject; "such as the argument from ecclesiastic history, the origin of "modern sects, and such matter as Mr. M'Calla introduced, "having no bearing upon the controversy whatever. Of this "the reader will have a full specimen in the sixth and seventh "days." If Mr. Campbell were sincere in this excuse of irrelevancy for suppressing a part of my speeches, he would for the same reason have suppressed the whole of them: because, like my Universalist opponent, he declared in each of his addresses, that my preceding one was irrelevant. Both of them were constantly asserting that I had never yet come to the point, that I had not touched the subject, that I said nothing to the purpose, nothing that was in the least relevant to the question. I knew that these declarations were made only to blind the audience, and cover their own confusion: but how inconsistent is it in Mr. Campbell, to pretend after these assertions, that only two-sevenths of my matter was irrelevant. Besides, if my matter be irrelevant, would it not enhance his cause to publish and expose it, fully and fairly according to his promise? or would not such a fulfilment of his *bona fide* engagement, at least prove him an honest man? What would he think of Mr. Lowry who took notes of the debate, if he had issued such a Prospectus as his, and then given the public only a few pages for Mr. Campbell, because he thought all the rest irrelevant? Yet, according to this rule, such

must have been his report, as can be shewn by a letter of his to me, accompanying an abstract of his notes. The following are his words, viz. "You will probably be surprised that I have noted "so much nonsense, and matter foreign to the subject in debate. "This indeed needs an apology, and I have one at hand. I have "endeavoured to notice every argument that [Mr.] Campbell "used, as far as I could, and also carefully to preserve the plan "of the argument: but his arguments were given very much "without head or tail, without system or arrangement; and this "necessarily made it difficult to take any notes of them. Also, "the principal part of what he did say, was totally irrelevant and "foreign to the matter in dispute. This accounts for so much "of such matter in the notes. I am well satisfied from a care-"ful observation of [Mr.] Campbell's course, that he depended "for success, on throwing you or leading you off the solid ground "which you assumed at the commencement; and when he failed "of this, he found room for little else than scurrility, boasting "and challenging, and of these we had enough."

There was on the ground a professed stenographer, who leaned to the Baptist sentiments. He took notes for a while, but lost them by stealth or otherwise. As he heard Mr. Campbell converse freely on religion, I asked him to give me an account of his theology in writing. He did so, and volunteered some remarks on his conduct as a disputant. Considering his Baptist prejudices, it is wonderful how near he comes to Mr. Lowry's opinion. The following are his words, viz. "I attended the debate "as a humble enquirer, doubting, as I once told you before, on "which side the truth lay; and on the third and fourth days I "considered Mr. Campbell's arguments of considerable weight, "so that I was rather more inclined than before to embrace that "opinion. But from that time, while you continued to advance "argument, his sophistry and want of candour, which had before "manifested itself, became constantly more glaring, till the con-"viction was forced upon me, that the cause that needed such "weapons to defend it, could not be the cause of truth, could not "be the cause of God." From this testimony it appears that Mr. Campbell made a mistake in suppressing my speeches of the two last days for the want of relevancy. It was only his own that were irrelevant.

My antagonist's excuse for this conduct contains a concession which he and his Baptist friends have not been accustomed to making. It is "that the argument from ecclesiastic[al] history," and "the origin of the modern sects," is wholly irrelevant to the dispute between us. Among "all" the "publications on the "doctrine of baptism, that have come" in Mr. Brewster's "way, "for forty years," I doubt whether many have treated this argument as unworthy of notice. I could almost answer for the editors of the Columbian Star, that Mr. Campbell is the first man whom they have known for fifty years, who "in a most mas-"terly manner, supported the cause he had espoused," without

directly or indirectly calling to their aid this argument which is now exploded by this masterly and "unexceptionable" production. Even this "faithful servant of the church" never made the discovery until the debate in Kentucky. His former publications brandish this weapon over our heads with terrific effect, as he and his admirers thought. So confident was he of its temper, that he could not consent to sheath it at my earnest and repeated solicitations. But now that he has made a full trial of its metal, he is willing to lay it aside as irrelevant, and bury the affair in oblivion; pretending that he never wished to touch a matter so foreign to the subject, but that "Mr. M'Calla introduced" it.

When Mr. Campbell had finished his report of five days, he found himself in straits on all sides. He had printed his prospectus before he ever saw Kentucky or his perverse Kentucky Antagonist. When he first endeavoured to get subscribers, he expected that the debate would occupy three hours, or a day at most. This would make too little a book for his views. He therefore promised, in the same volume, animadversions on a book of Dr. Mason's, and on four pamphlets, written severally by an Episcopalian, a Methodist, a Presbyterian, and a Seceder; the last by Mr. Walker, his old Antagonist. According to his proposals, he could not demand compensation for more than 400 pages. After all the shameless suppressions of the first five days, they brought him at last to his 342nd page. This made it necessary that he should in some measure lay aside the mask, or diminish his expected pecuniary profits. To lose the money appeared to his disinterestedness, the worse alternative. He therefore preferred the former. In addition to these difficulties on the right and on the left, perhaps the recollection of past corruptions haunted his memory, and the consequences of future forgeries stared him in the face: for I would have you know that in treating the historical topics of this question, I was obliged to convict him of some very naughty things, and place him in very bad company. For particulars I shall have to refer you to my argument on those subjects: a single specimen it may be proper to give here. In the history of the mode of Baptism, I was obliged to show the unfairness of Baptist authors, in claiming so many Pedobaptist writers, as holding their doctrine that submersion is essential to Baptism. Among the many high authorities quoted by them and by my opponent, the great Dr. Wall, our most eminent controversialist, held a conspicuous place. In several parts of his book, I shewed the Doctor's own words, denying the fact. In one place I read a *quarto* page, where he not only denies the fact, but exposes the dishonesty of Danvers, (another Campbell,) for charging this opinion upon such Pedobaptists as "Scapula, Stephanus, Pasor, Vossius, Leigh, Casaubon, Beza, Chamier, Hammond, Cajetan, Musculus, Piscator, Calvin, Keckerman, Diodat, Grotius, Davenant, Tilenus, Dr. Cave, Walafridus Strabo, and Archbishop Tillotson." I read Wall's declaration that Danvers quotes "all these in such words as if they had made dipping to be of the essence of Baptism."

I read also Wall's assertion that Mr. Walker, an old writer, had shewn that this Danvers "has abused every one of them; "by affixing to some of them words that they never said, "by adding to others, by altering and mistranslating others, "and by curtailing the words of the rest." In addition to this I was obliged to shew, from Mr. Campbell's former publications, that he was a legitimate son of this Danvers. Is it any wonder that he and his friends have become sick of the historical argument, which he compelled me to canvass? Is a man of his principles going to publish these things against himself? Give any convict the power, and he will soon obliterate the records of the court. To him, at least, they will appear irrelevant.

6. *Alterations.* In Mr. Campbell's report of the debate with Mr. Walker, the latter says that there are many alterations. In page 49, he makes Mr. Walker "ask him for a positive command for the institution of a church?" In the 12th page of Mr. Walker's reply, the real question is declared to be, "Have we a positive command for all the acknowledged institutions of the church?" What a difference can be made by a little alteration! After his debate with me, he discovered that his incessant challenging rendered him ridiculous. To prevent this from being so visible in the Report as it was audible in the debate, he sometimes drops those bravadoes, and sometimes changes the word *challenge* for some other. In page 72, he substitutes the word *call*. "I have called and called upon my opponent," &c. In the argument on household baptism, I read some quotations from profane Greek authors. Mr. Campbell's plan in such cases, was, to endeavour to "*alarm the natives*," by boasting in the most extravagant manner, of his superior acquaintance with Greek literature, and by expressing the most profound contempt of my ignorance. On the occasion just mentioned, he said, with a most pompous air, "Now we have not read Rice's Pamph-"leteer, but we have read ALL of the writings of Aristotle and "Plato, in the original." In his report, this great word ALL is altered into SOME! What a descent!

> "The king of France, with twice ten thousand men,
> "March'd up a hill, and then march'd down again."

His writing specimens and summaries and abstracts instead of speeches for me, gave him fine scope for the exercise of this art. Many things, such as the recapitulation of page 382, and the burlesque challenge of 393, I shall not take time to explain in this place. Page 128 gives an opportunity of testing Mr. Rigdon's certificate, that his master has given "a fair and full exhibition "of" my "topics of illustration." Speaking of the sameness of the Jewish and Christian church, I argued that their nominal and circumstantial differences should be no objection to the doctrine of their ecclesiastical identity. Among my illustrations, one was very familiar to the audience. I observed that before my settlement among them, the congregation which I then served, met at Germantown, and was called the Germantown Church. It after-

ward worshipped statedly in Augusta, and was called the Augusta Church. Yet the church of Germantown and the Augusta church were not two, but one and the same church. Mr. Campbell's *fair* and *full exhibition* of my illustration excludes the nominal difference entirely, and expresses the circumstantial difference in a manner which is not consistent with perspicuity or with truth.

His marks of quotation in pages 319 to 23, shew that he gives my speech in the words of another person, probably Mr. Rallston, as his name is mentioned. Besides professedly omitting one extract from Dr. Rice in page 286, he makes me cast out another, and substitute for it an extract from Dr. Rallston. This alteration is repeated in the next page and in 280. Instead of a diffuse argument from Dr. Rice, he makes me say, in page 266, "Mr. Rallston's condensed view of this argument proceeds thus." In page 258, which introduces another substitution of Rallston for Rice, a bracketted note contains evidence in his own words, that in all these cases, he has altered the diffuse arguments of one author into the condensed views of another. Another note in the margin of page 252, confesses that, instead of my copious extracts from Dr. Wall, he has put into my mouth, "a *miniature*," "*condensed view*," from J. P. Campbell's sermon In a bracketted note in page 300, he confesses that he has there bestowed upon me several pages from the same author, although I never quoted them, and never knew to this moment, where they are to be found in his works, if they are to be found there at all. But he justifies this alteration upon two grounds: one is, that I "seemed to have taken" my argument from Dr. Campbell; another is, that that author "precisely expresses" my "sentiments "as noted down." His notes must have been remarkably accurate and wonderfully useful; since they enabled him to guess, (however incorrectly) at the character and source of my arguments, and to make so judicious a selection of the author in whose words he should express my sentiments. Instead of giving me so good a spokesman as my friend Dr. Campbell, he has in pages 376, 377, altered a speech of mine, into a perfect caricature of his own manufacture. In answer to his slanders against all Pedobaptists, I observed that the men of Munster and of the rustic war were as lawless a race as the Crusaders, whose predatory bands were no better than hen-roost-robbers. Mr. Campbell informs the public, in the above pages, that I assured the audience that "some" "of the German Anabaptists" "were "robbers of hen-houses." I observed that the tyrant of Munster, to gratify his lust, encouraged polygamy among his followers, and so perfectly despotic was he, that when one of his fifteen wives committed a slight verbal offence, he took off her head with the sword in presence of the rest, who, for fear of the same fate, loudly extolled his justice, and danced round the dead body of their companion with feigned hilarity. For this Mr. Campbell, in the above places, substitutes the following sentence, viz. "Some of them had from three to a dozen wives, one orthodox

Anabaptist cut the heads off three, or perhaps thirteen, of his wives, and danced at their exit."

He shews great art in altering my comments on scripture texts. In proof of the ecclesiastical identity of the Old and New Testament churches, I quoted Matt. viii. 11, 12, "that many [Gentiles] shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob [Jews] in the kingdom of heaven, [the church on earth:] but the children of the kingdom, [the unbelieving Jews] shall be cast out [of the church on earth:"] for out of the kingdom above, none shall ever be cast out. Besides other follies, Mr. Campbell makes me say "that the Jews are represented in Matt. viii. 11, 12, as being members of the kingdom of heaven or evangelical dispensation." But he is not satisfied with altering comments, he does not hesitate on some occasions, to alter the sacred text. In his anxiety to prove that the Christian Church was a new kingdom, and not a new branch of the old Abrahamic church, he quoted Dan. vii. 14, as follows; "And there was given him dominion and glory and a NEW kingdom." The word "*new*" was not given by him as an allowable paraphrastical interpolation of his own, but it was repeatedly urged as that emphatical word of the sacred text, which proved his point. Of this the Rev. John R. Moreland was a witness, for he opened his bible at the time to see if it was possible that the word *new* was in the text. In page 345, he alters the version of Junius and Tremellius, and gives his forgery as the rendering of those eminent translators. He tells us that Mr. M'Calla's "application of the words, 'so shall he sprinkle many nations,' is "availing himself of a mistaken rendering, which Junius and "Tremellius have corrected, it reads 'so shall he astonish ma"ny nations.'" I had Junius and Tremellius with me, and shewed that his translation was, "so shall he *sprinkle* [with astonishment,] many nations." But I took another step which Mr. Campbell's dull and fair report has totally overlooked. I proved that "so shall he *sprinkle* many nations," was a correct translation of the original, and told the audience that the book which I then held open in my hand was Parkhurst's Hebrew English Dictionary, which would shew this intelligibly even to the unlearned.

It is well known that Luke i. 72, is esteemed a strong proof of the identity of the Jewish and Christian churches: for it represents Christ as coming not to destroy the Abrahamic church and covenant, but "to perform the mercy promised to our fathers and to remember his holy covenant." In the 159th page of Mr. Campbell's book against Mr. Walker, he, in a great measure, neutralizes this text by an alteration. Instead of "to our fathers," he writes "by the Father." After it had been written in two editions, Mr. Walker exposed it in the 14th page of his reply, which complains that it is far from being a solitary error of this sort. My quotations of scripture from memory, were, during the debate, as they are at all times, apt to be inaccurate. On this

account Mr. Campbell scornfully told the audience that he did not believe that I could, from memory, quote five verses of the Bible correctly. In a note in his 335th page, he alters this invidious remark, and considerably aggravates it, by saying that Mr. M'Calla "appeared not to have any one paragraph of a few "verses so familiar as to refer to it without *material* alterations "or deviations from the text." That this novel accusation is perfectly groundless, will appear from one fact: and that is that in all his addresses, whether spoken or written, he has not shewn, nor, to my knowledge, attempted to shew, one such material alteration or deviation. Among all my mistakes he has not been able to find one which favoured my cause. But Mr. Campbell's alterations are not from weakness of memory, for they are deliberately written and printed, and that in more than one edition. Neither are they trifling verbal inaccuracies; but to use his own words, they are "material alterations or deviations from the text." They are comparatively few in number, but so well selected, and so sagaciously constructed that every one of them tells. Each of them answers some important purpose to his cause, either on the subject or the mode of baptism. His alterations of Daniel and Luke materially affect our argument on the identity of the Jewish and Christian churches, and of course our obligation to administer to infants the initiatory seal of the church. And his altered quotation of Junius and Tremellius is professedly intended to make Isaiah exclude sprinkling from the mode of baptism, although this was in direct opposition to the literal and real import of the Hebrew original. In the 417th page of his book against me, he very awkwardly and evasively insinuates that his alteration of Luke i. 72, of which Mr. Walker had convicted him, was a mere typographical error: but in the very same paragraph, he makes a statement which is not true. It is that "all the exceptions made [in "Mr. Walker's own treatise,] against the faithfulness of that statement of the debate," written by Mr. Campbell, "altogether would not make one page." Now besides several pages of exceptions written by Mr. Walker himself, his publication contains a dozen pages of exceptions, by one of the Moderators. Mr. Campbell's express design in limiting these exceptions to one page, was to prove the correctness of his report from the testimony of his antagonist. He says that if all Mr. Walker's exceptions "were well substantiated, it [Mr. "Campbell's report] would appear from Mr. Walker's own trea- "tise, to be a correct representation of the controversy." The Moderator's letter, which is an approved part of Mr. Walker's book, declares Mr. Campbell guilty of "the propagation of falsehoods the most naked and gross." (a) In page 239, he gives us one of Mr. Campbell's *alterations;* at the close of which he observes that "it is sufficient to discover his disinclination or incapacity at any time, where fact is concerned, to state the truth." "However," says he, "to pursue Mr. Campbell through all his meanderings, to detect him in all his mis-statements of facts,

(a) See page 233.

and to correct him in all his aberrations from scriptural principle, would be almost an endless undertaking." In page 11, Mr. Walker himself says that Mr. Campbell "appears only to have "introduced as many of Mr. Walker's arguments as served his "purpose; and even these are presented in such a mutilated "form, that he (Mr. C.) might the more easily manage them." In page 12, he says, "Out of many examples, I shall only note "a few, and let these serve for the remainder." How strange a testimony is this for establishing the correctness of Mr. Campbell's report! Comparatively a few errors are quoted, only as a specimen of a work, which has so many, that not one argument is fairly represented;———of a work which propagates falsehoods the most naked and gross; to detect which would be "almost an endless undertaking;"———of a work, whose author has a "disinclination or incapacity, at any time, where fact is concerned, to state the truth:" These declarations go to shew that Mr. Campbell's report is false throughout, as to fact and argument, wherever falsehood would answer his purpose. Yet these declarations he treats as so many attestations of his correctness. If these are compliments, it is hoped that he will give me credit for more than one page of them. My tedious letter to you will shew that I cordially agree with the above gentlemen, in their account of his moral character, and of his labours as a reporter. This remark applies to the whole of his book against me. even bating the many particulars which I have specified.

As you are within a day's ride of Lexington, you have probably heard that your old acquaintance, and Mr. Campbell's particular friend and brother Dr. James Fishback of that place, has left it, perhaps forever. He passed through this place lately on his way to Boston, to take charge of a Baptist congregation which the Rev. Mr. Wayland has lately left. A Baptist of the highest standing informed me, the other day, that the Doctor's avowed object in going to Boston, was to oppose the Unitarians. I should not give the contemptuous name of *heresy-hunter* to a truly pious and Orthodox man who would go all the way from Lexington to Boston for such a purpose. Neither would I give the odious name of *crusade*, to his long journey on so glorious an errand. Time, however, will disclose whether Dr. Fishback is such a man, gone on such a pilgrimage, for such an end. To you who are so well acquainted with his character, I need not mention half the changes which he has undergone in politics and religion. From your knowledge of these, you perhaps doubt his qualifications for acting the part of a reformer in Boston. You recollect that while he was practising medicine, he felt urgently moved to undertake the reformation of the Lexington bar. Unhappily, however, before he got license to plead, his views of right and wrong underwent such a change, that it was difficult for a stranger to tell which of the lawyers was the reformer and who needed most to be reformed. Forgetting his original design, he endeavoured (but in vain) to get into the Legislature, to effect a reformation there. Since this disappointment his chief attention

has been given to religion, or rather to *religions*; for on this subject he might say as Legion did, "we are many."

Although his literary education did not, I believe, go farther than to read the Latin of Virgil, yet you know that from his godly and exemplary parents, he had what was far more important, a religious education. When a student of medicine, and living in my Father's house, he was esteemed a believer in revelation. By a habit of espousing any cause indifferently in colloquial litigation, he was subsequently known as an infidel for some years. Afterward, "when he returned to his former sentiments, he was sometimes a Predestinarian and sometimes an Anti-predestinarian. He, at length professed to be settled on this and other doctrinal points in our Creed, and joined the communion of the first Presbyterian Church in Lexington. One day a French Quaker preached in our pulpit! After sermon the Doctor went to my Father's house, which, for many years he very much frequented; and advocated the Quaker's notion of being moved by the Spirit, as to the time, place, circumstances, and matter of his discourse. By way of corrective, I opened Dr. Archibald Alexander's sermon, preached before the General Assembly, and read his caution against this and the opposite error of denying the operation of the Spirit altogether. After a while, Mr. Thomas B. Craighead came to Lexington, and preached the latter error. This also Dr. Fishback embraced, although on the opposite extreme from his former opinion. He and I belonged to the same prayer meeting. One evening I prayed for the fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel, "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh." When we arose from our knees, the Doctor took his hat, and formally resigned his membership in our meeting, because he could not cordially join in our devotions. The Session afterward suspended him from the communion of the church for this Pelagian doctrine of his, and on his appeal, the Presbytery confirmed their sentence. From them he appealed to the Synod, in whose presence you and I both heard him give as a reason for leaving the prayer-meeting, that its members prayed for the out-pouring of the Spirit of God! as if this blessing which belonged to the days of miracles, was to be expected in our day! The Synod sustained his appeal, on account of alledged informality in the original process; but so clear was their perception of his heretical pravity, and so manifest was their disapprobation of it, that from that time he seems to have entertained little or no hope of being authorized to preach by any of their Presbyteries. As he was not sure of becoming a bishop among the Anglican or Methodist Episcopalians, the Baptist Church, the strongest in Kentucky, offered the fairest field for his ambition. Before he resolved to join them, he was a very decided Pedobaptist. He had a slave called Billy, who was a Baptist Preacher. I have been diverted at the glee with which the Doctor used to relate his controversy with Billy on the rebaptism of the twelve disciples of John, by Paul's order at Ephesus. According to his own account, the Master, of course, triumphed at the time; but the man gained

the ultimate victory, for the Doctor went over to his side. Before taking this step, he wrote a book, a great part of which was directed against the internal, sanctifying influences of the Spirit of God. After his immersion and ordination, many of his ministerial brethren shewed considerable opposition to him on account of his corruption. To secure his standing among them, he was obliged to preach the doctrine of spiritual influences in as plain and strong a manner as he well could, and to deny that he had ever meant to oppose it. Some of them could not help seeing that his book was in direct opposition to this essential doctrine of Christianity, and they could not be satisfied unless he would renounce his book. But instead of doing this, he continued to circulate it privately, and after his acquaintance with Mr. Campbell who has written much against the same doctrine, he felt himself strong enough, as I am informed, to sell his book publicly.

The sincerity of Dr. Fishback's professions to the Baptists of Philadelphia can be tested by his conduct in Kentucky. If he has such a zealous antipathy against Unitarianism, why did he take into his bosom, Mr. Alexander Campbell, the disciple of Robinson, who was the avowed disciple of Priestly? It is well known that Dr. Holley, Principal of Transylvania University, is one of the most depraved Unitarians that ever infested Boston. For Mr. Campbell to advocate him is natural. But who can believe that Dr. Fishback, who has now gone all the way to Boston, to oppose Unitarianism, supported this Boston Unitarian of the worst stamp, much more effectively than Mr. Campbell could. Verily the walls of their northern Jericho have very little to fear from his horn.

And here it will not avail in proof of his consistency, to say that before his departure from Kentucky, he became disaffected to Dr. Holley. It is as easy for rogues to fall out without reformation, as for Pilate and Herod to be reconciled without regeneration. The question is, what made this Pelagian sick of his brother Unitarian? Was it any rottenness in his creed or immorality in his practice? His guilt in both these respects, was well known to Dr. Fishback while he acted as a tool of the President. For his services in this capacity, he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity; which, from such hands, was perhaps as good an evidence of merit, as the gift of a Bishopric from Charles the 2nd. But the Doctor was not to be satisfied by such a parchment play-thing. He could very well distinguish between the empty barrel of a Doctorate, and the rich cargo of the Morrison Professorship. The University could easily give the former to any man as a bribe, but to bestow the latter on a man of Dr. Fishback's attainments, would, in their view, sink the ship. It is this that made the people of Kentucky laugh when Dr. Fishback deserted his old master. They knew that this hundredth change of the most changeable man that they ever knew, was not from principle, but from disappointed ambition. And they now know that the man who, in Lexington, supported Dr.

Holley, from the hope of a Professorship in Transylvania University, would, in Boston, support Dr. Kirkland, for a Professorship in Harvard University. Andrew Fuller shewed the sincerity of his opposition to Unitarianism, by denouncing Robert Robinson, the greatest champion of Anabaptism that England ever produced: Dr. Fishback shews the insincerity of his pretensions by taking to his bosom Mr. Alexander Campbell, the most conspicuous disciple of Robinson which our country contains. From him he was infected with the *anti-homologetical* fever. On his admission to the pulpit of Mr. Dagg, the Baptist successor of Dr. Staughton in this place, he preached against creeds and confessions, in such terms as broadly infer that all who adhere to them are on the road to perdition. This is a fine preparation for setting Boston to rights. The arguments of Mr. Campbell, Mr. Duncan, and the *liberal* men of Massachusetts have probably convinced him before now, that the Council of Nice was extremely guilty, in excommunicating Arius for denying that Christ was of the same essence with God the Father!! Consistency will then require him to acknowledge the Christian character and ministerial standing of his polished Arian acquaintances, at least so far as to exchange pulpits with them, as some specimens of Orthodoxy, already settled there, are in the habit of doing. When he has gone over to them a very little farther, their reformation will be complete. Then Dr Fishback will have the credit of converting the Unitarians to his system, as Dr. Priestley had the credit of converting the Infidels to his. To secure them from relapses, it would be well to see to it, that the next vacancies occasioned by the removal of Orthodox Baptist ministers should be filled by Mr. Campbell, Sidney Rigdon, and Mr. Duncan, who will take care that the error of the Nicene Council shall never be repeated. From such reformers, may the Divine Head of the Church deliver his people. How different is your course from that of these self-conceited men! Instead of strutting in what they call *the march of mind*, and instead of dreaming that your wonderful wisdom is always making improvements in the Christian system, you are satisfied to take religion as it was long ago revealed in the Scriptures, and as you conscientiously and intelligently believe it was acknowledged by Augustine, by the worthies of the sixteenth century, by the Synod of Dort, and by the Westminister Assembly. For the Christian system as thus revealed, and thus maintained, you have suffered much obloquy, and are willing, if necessary, to suffer even to blood. May Kentucky never want such able and faithful champions of the truth, as you have been. Thus prays one who has watched you for near thirty years, and who hopes in time and eternity to remain

Your affectionate brother in Jesus Christ,

W. L. M'CALLA.

Philadelphia, Sept. 26, 1826.

No. 16.

Mr. Campbell's Religious Character,

As given by Mr. Greatrake, a highly esteemed, regular Baptist Minister, in Mr. Campbell's neighbourhood. Out of several pamphlets, we can only copy his 4th, 5th and 6th Letters with a part of his 3d to Mr. Campbell, his circular to the Western Baptists, and a few extracts from his "Miniature Portrait of Alexander Campbell."

Mr. Greatrake to Mr. Campbell.

. . . . . the character of individuals, in your sphere particularly, is fairly ascertainable in all its essential features, by coming to a knowledge of its effect upon those with whom it has estimation. That you have many admirers and adherents there is no doubt; that they have been sitting at your feet learning of you, and holding up to their view your character, as a model for their imitation, is equally certain. Now, if the many of these individuals with whom I have been more or less acquainted, have not been most bungling scholars, they have been taught by you, and others more immediately your subordinates, a variety of sentiments, which, if not altogether new, is at least so in relation to their influence among the Baptist churches in America. And though it is in the chapter of probabilities that your sentiments may have been *misunderstood*, yet what is found as the views of your professed disciples, will be necessarily considered as the production of your labours, and correlative with your opinions. In the first place then, we notice, that among your adherents, pupils, or disciples, there are those who believe, and have publicly declared, that a man by being baptized was made as holy as an angel! or which is the same thing, and to use the words *literatim*, that "he came up out of the water as holy as an angel."—Again, it has been said by some of them, that "the Almighty had been tired of his own moral law for 1500 years, when he abrogated it by the New Testament dispensation, and that it is no longer a rule of conduct for the believer in the Lord Jesus Christ!"—Again, many of your adherents profess to scout the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's immediate influence in regeneration, as well as in all subsequent stages of christian life, and to denominate the well known *characteristic experience* of spiritual Israel, a mere phantasy, or mass of mysticism.—Again, they profess to believe that prayer is no duty, but rather an insult to the majesty of heaven. Such are some of the horrible brood of sentiments entertained and expressed by individuals who are recognized as under-teachers to you, as well as others who are your joint hearers. Now, I do not exactly say that these and other kindred doctrines are the offspring of your own teeming brain, but you are certainly and strongly suspected of having begotten them in their ductile pericraniums by certain secret intercourses; though under more public circumstances you have appeared rather to disown the progeny. If such sentiments, sir, are really the product of your system of theology, the results of your writings and your labours, you must have a mind circumstanced to enjoy them! and I can conceive your feelings of admiration and exultance, while you fondle with, and hang over them with a father's love and father's *hopes*, to be closely allied to the sensations of Milton's Satan, when for the first time he beheld his incestu-

ous grand-children, the progeny of sin and death, y'clept hell hounds. Whether, sir, you be, or be not, the teacher of such doctrines, is of little consequence, as long as they have the authority of your name. Of such sentiments, at least some of them, I am free to say, that they exceed the whole sum of blasphemies that ever I met with in the character of men or devils, and the propagators thereof ought to be known and hung upon the gibbets of public infamy. But leaving every thing that cannot absolutely be identified as part of your opinions, speculations, and teachings, we will proceed to notice what is as tangible thereof as the leaves of your "Christian Baptist." You are then, in the first place, endeavouring to create universal distrust of the ministry, in all denominations, bating an occasional qualification in the admission of an individual now and then, as an exception to the degraded character you give of the rest. Those individuals that are your *exceptions* may be calculated upon as those of whom you expect to make *partizans* in your own scheme of operations: hence the occasional allusion to them in different and well-timed expressions of panegyrick, becomes a stroke of policy, and not a feeling of charity. But for what, sir, is this almost universal attack upon the character of ministers made? the end in view is obvious; and that end is, *that you may dissolve, if possible, existing connexions between pastors and people, and thus effect the first step towards making the latter your followers, or the proselytes to your system of theology, under the direction of your agents! and in thus doing, consummate the measure of your fame by becoming the acknowledged head of some new, though yet nameless sect.* That you really believe, sir, what you intimate and assert of the dishonesty and selfishness of ministers, I do not doubt: the reason is, that you never had the necessary *mental perception* to see the real and *spiritual* pastors and servants of the church of Christ, and having met with many that were the reverse, and the constituents of whose character you could by natural affinity analyze, you have suspected the whole to be of the same base material.—The subject we shall notice more fully hereafter. This spirit of distrust we know you are labouring to diffuse in every direction, and while it is evidently to the end, and for the object we have suggested, you have the effrontery to pass it off as a labour of love, an expression of dininterested zeal for the church of Christ.—Again, we know that you propagate the doctrine of the church's independency, so far as to exclude all reference to articles of faith, and principles of order upon which they have been founded, (I am now speaking of the Baptist church) this your writings are uniformly understood to aim at. And really, sir, your attempt to disseminate this sort of sentiment, in the Baptist church in particular, demonstrates your very great attainment in impudence, or that you are extremely ignorant of the constituents of social unity and order, as I shall hereafter endeavour to exhibit. Can you suppose that any reflecting intelligent member of the Baptist church, will ever conceive favourably of that man, or have confidence in the purity of his motives, who attempts to destroy the very foundation upon which the denomination has risen to such imposing magnitude, in such fair proportions, and with such solidity? indeed, sir, the attempt on your part, or that of any other person, bears testimony of a radical defect in understanding, and can only leave you, (in the exercise of all possible charity) the character of the knight of La Mancha, or the phrenzied Swede. . . . . .

SIR,

In my last I noticed some of the moral impressions made upon the minds of that part of the community which are to be considered, more immediately, your disciples. Having adverted to certain of the doctrines held by them, as well as to their general sentiments respecting church order and government, and in the recognition thereof seen, what may be fairly considered as additional features of your own character; I shall proceed to raise up some other characteristics of the same fraternity. For brevity and distinctness sake, I will fix your attention upon a solitary church, as a specimen of the whole, and as sufficient to afford you, a tolerably correct estimate of the general results of your labours. In this church there are two Pastors, or Elders, or Teachers, as you please: one of them occupies an entire sabbath, in expounding a certain part of the scripture to his flock, who are immensely delighted and edified by the luminous, as they think, discourse; and run to and fro through their respective neighbourhoods to proclaim the erudition and the knowledge of their semi-pastor who last addressed them—while he hies away to his worthy associate and fellow-labourer, to tell him how his audience had been astonished at his learning, delighted with his commentaries, ravished with his eloquence, and *established in their faith.* He then proceeds to give his coadjutor a summary of all he had said in the course of the lecture, which is no sooner communicated to the former, than he very gravely tells him, that the whole of his views upon the subject are entirely different from his; and proceeds to give an exhibit of what he conceives to be the legitimate, and the true meaning of the subject. Our lecturer no sooner hears the sentiments of his dear help-mate, than in true philosophical mood of indifference, he observes, well, brother A. if what you say be true, I must have instructed the people erroneously, but never mind, the people are pleased with what I said and I am pleased too; and as we, only, are interested in the case, I do not see that there is any occasion to take further notice of it. Besides, brother A. your charity ought to cover all such infirmities; add to which, you know not how soon you may stand in need of equal forbearance. And sure enough, sir, this intimation of brother A. turned out in the end to be a literal prediction; for it was not long before Elder A. had occasion to acknowledge, that he had found himself to have been in *something* of an error for a long time; having disbelieved in the influences of the Holy Ghost upon the human mind, subsequent to the apostle's days; but that now he thought it was a New Testament doctrine—*the word said so.* And though he might not teach it, for fear of collision with his amiable brother, and out of reciprocal charity; yet he would believe in the doctrine, to the end I suppose, that his faith might be *verbatim et literatim*, as was that of the Jews of old, who considered themselves orthodox believers if they knew the number of words in the Pentateuch, and kept them stored up in their head; no matter who was the occupant of the heart, one, or one legion of devils.

But to proceed with our sketch of the character we have noticed—leaving their personal difference in sentiment, let us follow them to the field of their public, social, and private ministerial exercises. Behold one of them going forth to the margin of the river, where a number of raftmen and others are engaged in their avocations: these are unregenerate, impenitent, perishing sinners, as you and I sir, are by nature. To a posse of these characters, your El-

der directs his way, and commences an harangue, by telling them, "that they are not under the law; that the ten commandments are abrogated, as well as the ceremonies of the Old Testament dispensation; that the world is full of priestcraft; that preachers of the gospel, as they call themselves, are only preaching for money; that himself, and the system with which he revolves round his *splendid centre*, is the true light." With a hundred other things of the same sort, and a thousand other, and different sayings, quite as irrelevant to the gospel. After having finished his address, his auditors separate from him, some saying, that he is a noble fellow, that he has extracted from their conscience, something like fragments of the law, that had been there all their lives, like thorns, when they devised, or perpetrated, what they had been taught were crimes. Others declare him to be truly an antinomian—others understand him to denounce the doctrine of the Spirit's influence, and to treat it as an idle notion—others understand him as absolutely calling in question the divinity of Jesus Christ—and a socinian present cries out, *my brother*—while others believe, that in this single address, he has advocated, and rebutted all, and every one of these sentiments; together with many more. Are you not delighted, sir, with the clearness of this man's perceptions—the intelligence of his mind—the piety of his doctrines—the solidity of his system altogether; when the exhibition thereof, produces no more opposition of views among his hearers, than just—antipodes. Paul could rejoice that he was a father to Timothy—But O! how superlative must be your joy to be the father of so many children as you are, of whom the above character is a specimen; how enviable must be the lot of your disciples to have provision made for their guidance of such able leaders, and intelligent instructors. "Treading the crude consistence, half on foot, half flying—o'er bog, or steep, through strait rough, dense, or rare; they swim, or sink, or wade, or creep, or fly." While, indeed, the hubbub of their jarring notions and sentiments, carries forward the resemblance between their situation and that of the *celebrated* personage, to whom the above extract is originally applied, when he was groping his way, through chaos and old night. We will follow the same Elder of yours to the exercises of social worship. See him recumbent upon some three or four chairs, with his segar in his mouth; disposing of its smoke with one respiration, and going on by breaks, with a lecture, *on some part of divine truth*, with another—or, standing up at the fire, mingling the fumes of his tobacco pipe, with the breath of prayer and praise issuing from the mouth of his professed brethren, while engaged in their devotions! but we will stop; nor wound any more the religious sensibilities of the children of God, by a further exhibit of the flagrant abominations, and blasphemous irreverence towards "*him* whom their soul loveth." Leaving your Elders, sir, we come to notice, briefly, some of the features of the character belonging to those we may call your lay-men: and well do we find established, in refering to this part of the subject, the prophet's adage, "like priest, like people;" the most of whom, connected with you, shew, conspicuously, that vanity rules in and over them. They are not so politic as you, sir; they cannot, indeed, put any restraint upon their ruling passion; but, under its influence, many of them, "play such fantastic tricks before high heaven," as, if not to make angels weep, at least to make devils laugh, and fill with sorrow the breast of every real christian; particularly those of the Baptist denomination, upon whom, their character and conduct brings the

reproach of the wicked, the contempt of the wise, and pity of the good. As two or three specimens of the whole fraternity, we remark—here is a man who has borne the name, and made the profession of almost every sect in Christendom —say, Catholic, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Universalist, Socinian: at last he comes to your society, professing to be a convert to your theology, (though that's all a gratuitous assertion, for mortal ken never yet discerned what it is) he says that he will join your fraternity, and at his induction deliver an address upon baptism. All this being acceded to, the time arrives when he is to be baptized: and at the water he delivers an harangue of five hours in length, or in other words, gives a recitation of what you have compiled and published upon that ordinance, from the writings of other men. And to crown the inconsistency of the whole, you, sir, the would be *star of the west;* you, become his amanuensis, and the pitiful caterer to this vain man's vanity, by virtually professing, to be taking down notes of something new upon the subject, from what this speckled disciple of yours is saying; whereas, in fact, he is advancing nothing but what is as old as his great-grand-father. Now, sir, think you, that if this man had been a *poor, humble, broken-hearted sinner, as he ought to have been before he was baptized,*that he would have had any disposition to obtrude himself upon the notice of men at such a time? particularly, after having exhibited such an unsettled mind through a period of many years as he did, and such a fitful scene of profession and reprofession. Or, sir, if you had been a regenerated man yourself, and a fit person to be a minister of the gospel, do you think that your thoughts, and your gratification, would have been in, or your time and labour devoted to, making a record of what this poor deluded man said about the mode of baptism? no, sir, you would not; but instead of this, your soul would have burned within you to make, if possible, the conversion of this man, had he been converted, the means, under the Holy Ghost, of making your auditors, or the spectators, humble penitents towards God, and *spiritual believers in Christ Jesus—and not merely proselytes to baptism.* Instead of this, what has been done? the *disciple* has had his vanity gratified, by being the orator of the day; and rising (like an ignis fatuus from the bog) for a few moments, a little above the level to which nature designed him in the community, to sink again to the same place, confirmed in a delusion, perhaps, that shall only be dissipated in hell: (I mean by delusion, *that baptism is salvation.*) The vanity of the society to which he has connected himself, is gratified in being *numerically* enlarged; and your vanity, sir, was gratified, in being recognized, as the mighty agent by which this Jack-o'-the lanthern professor was caught, and safely secured within the pale of your society. Here then, is an expression of the vanity of your society; and the same is visible in nearly all your followers. If they read the Scriptures, it is only to get some additional notions about them, to the end, that they may gratify their pride and their vanity in the exhibition of these speculations. Their tongues are ever going like the pendulum of a clock, and with as much noise, almost, as the machinery of a steam engine; indeed, it is the fullest trial of the saint's patience to listen to them: and that is the best thing that results from their acquirements. Some of them say,they have been regenerated—some of them say, there is no regeneration—some of them admit, that part of their brethren deny the spirit's influence in any stage of the christian's life, but that they believe it, though they consider disbelief

as nothing essentially defective in faith—some of them say, that they would never have fellowship with teacher or laymen in their body, who denied the spirit's influence, and that none of their brethren do it; while others maintain, that the word is the spirit, and the spirit is the word, and that it is no matter whether there is any spirit or no: meditation, *social, family and closet prayer*, are, for the most part, esteemed a matter of foolishness with them. I have, sir, you will perceive, made some exceptions among those who are your followers from the character I have been briefly exhibiting of them, Deeply do I regret that I have to make such exceptions; I would that all who follow you were what I most solemnly believe, and feel well assurred the greater part are, *ungenerate persons:* but I feel afraid, that there are gracious souls who have been led away after you, as Barnabas was by the dissimulation of false teachers in former times; they are given up, perhaps, to be buffeted by you, as Peter was by Satan, to the end, that they may learn similar lessons to what he did. For them I feel, sir; and had it not been for them I should have never addressed a line to you, or thought more about you than any other unregenerated man; you are filling their eyes with chaff, feeding them with husks, and quenching their thirst with waters fouled to the most abomniable stench. But I shall curb the feelings of my soul, until I come to address them in connexion with these letters to you; to spread out my feelings for them to you, would only be unintelligible jargon in your estimation. Having now given as much of an exhibit of the moral impressions, which your writings and your teachings, make upon the community that give heed thereto, as I deem necessary at present, I shall recapitulate that together with the previous investigation of your character, in my next and concluding letter, in which you will have brought to a point the estimation in which you are held by

A REGULAR BAPTIST.

Sir,

In recurrence to what I have written, you will perceive, I mean to be understood, as saying, that you never gave the Baptist denomination any evidence whatever, that your becoming professedly a Baptist yourself was the "answer of a good conscience;" on the contrary, there is much reason to believe, that you left the Pedobaptist ranks, and joined our denomination, from sinister and selfish motives. The whole series of your disposition and conduct toward that body, since you left them, must forcibly impress the mind of every close observer of human character, with the conviction, that mingled vanity and rage drive you on in your assault thereof. This conviction is deepened, when we take into notice, (and what is solemnly true) that no Pedobaptist church, possessing any thing of the *power of Godliness*, could ever derive any edification, or satisfaction under your ministry, though you were to be as laborious as Luther. This is a sentiment, in which every regenerated, spiritual man under the heavens, I know, will unite with me. Whatever ability they may concede to you, as a teacher of ecclesiastical history, or Biblical critic, they will all unite in saying, that however much you may amuse and instruct the head, you have no access to the believer's heart. You know not any thing of the history of *that*, from the dawn of regeneration, to the completion of its salvation in the beatific vision. Think, sir, on that! ten thousand thousand persons of different denominations of christians, and many of them in

every respect your superiors in *natural gifts*, would, if they knew you, declare simultaneously, that you know nothing about the "Heavenly Gift." Yea, the best spirits in even the denomination to which you now belong, consider you still dead in trespasses and sins, yea, they know it. As a man of some sense, such a circumstance, if true, must have a solemn impression upon your mind, however much you may appear to hector above all human opinions. The second particular to which we recur is, the subject of your public disputations and writings: in all of which, every intelligent man, and humble disciple of the meek and lowly Jesus, will perceive that you sacrifice to the idol self; and all the character that we challenged, as witnessess to your unregeneracy, will unite in declaring, that your professed zeal for one denomination is without knowledge, and your hostility to the other but beating the air; that both combined, demonstrate that you are radically ignorant of what are the essential constituents of every christian church. Were you not ignorant of these things, sir, you would never dare to level such unqualified anathemas against the Pedobaptist churches, particularly against that denomination from which you seceded. The most common placed mental integrity, would constrain you to neutralise the obloquy that you have poured upon it. Yea, policy would have prompted you to have done it—for we Baptists, *generally*, are not so bigotted and ignorant, as not to know, and acknowledge to the praise of sovereign grace, that there are, among the Pedobaptist churches, tens of thousands of blood-bought, heaven-born, heaven-bound souls: with them, in all the essential relationship of the gospel, we have refreshing fellowship; with them, grow up in *essential* faith; with them, twin in love, until we shall be forever one, visibly and invisibly, in the glorious head. Yes, and from the ministry of many of them, we Baptists receive the word of divine truth in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, again and again. We know and feel assured that they are *pastors after God's own heart*, and made overseers of the flock of Christ by the Holy Ghost. I say, we Baptists, in general, know and *feel* assured, that there are many, even of the Pedobaptist ministers, that bear this interesting relationship to us: and you may rest assured, that you might as well attempt to shake the foundations of the earth, as our confidence in them. We dare not call that common or unclean, which the living God has made clean, "by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" such character, let me tell you, sir, will always be transcendently higher in our estimation, as *regenerated spiritual* Baptists, though they should not observe one ordinance of the New Testament, than that like yours, though you had a "throat of brass, and adamantine lungs," worn out in contending for our ordinances, which we know to be truly gospel ones. *I have mentioned sober facts*, sir—you may dispose of them as you please. The third particular to which we refer, of what has been addressed to you, is the effect that your controversies have upon the Baptist denomination generally; and that is, they draw off their attention from fundamental principles of Godliness, to that which, abstractedly considered, can never give them estimation in the sight of God, or man. And little do you know of human nature, in its unregenerate or regenerate state, or you would never dare to engross the attention of mankind so much upon the subject of an ordinance: indeed, were you truly an evangelical minister of the gospel, you could not do it. But as we have said, your evident ignorance of every *spiritual* feature of the church of Christ, must in

a measure, plead your apology for spending all your time in making the *door of the house creak.* Nevertheless you must admit, that it is possible the noise may be productive of disturbance, to even your own family at times; and that they must, one and all, feel mortified to perceive it is publicly noticed, that one of their household can do nothing else. If you, sir, should succeed in proselyting four-fifths of the Pedobaptists denomination to the Baptist order, what would be the consequence? why, that our denomination would become incrustated with that much more wood, hay and stubble! for I take upon myself to say, that until God the Holy Ghost makes you a different, and a new creature, that no truly *spiritual* Pedobaptist would ever cast in his lot among a people, of whose character he was to judge by that of yours: no, not if he was never to have connexion with the church militant. So then, all we can calculate upon of proselytism is, of those from whom we had far better be separated. On the other hand, many alas! very many of the Baptists, it is to b feared, are, under your auspices, only solicitous to be known by a *name*, not by a *life*. If the spirits of departed saints can take cognizance of what transpires here on earth, it appears almost impossible, that those devoted, holy, and laborious servants of the cross, who, in sweat, in tears, and groans, and even blood, laid the foundation, under God the Holy Ghost, of the Baptist church in this Hemisphere; I say, one would suppose it almost impossible for them to be calm spectators of such desolation, as you are bringing in upon that spiritual vineyard for which they were spent to the last pulsation of their lives. But an attempt to make application of sentiment to you, sir, I am afraid, would be as unavailing as to extract sunbeams from cucumbers. The fact I wish to fix upon your attention is, that you are destroying much of the power and life of religion, in the Baptist denomination, by fixing their attention upon and engrossing their minds with subordinate articles of their faith; and that this is one of the results of all your debates, writings and orations. Literally, then, you may say, that your "zeal will eat them up."

The next particular that we shall recapitulate of our previous remark is, that your vanity is gratified, and your pecuniary interest advanced by the whole circle of your doings, and that these combined, are the grand controling principles from which you act. You pass for a man of vast comprehension of mind, and great attainments of knowledge; upon the same ground that what we call a common stone, is considered a wonder in some of the southern sections of the country, and gains the appellation of a rock, or that Guilliver passed for a giant among the Lilliputians. But, sir, whatever may be the amount of your *knowledge*, which I venture to say is nothing extraordinary, your judgement is certainly miserably defective, or you would never have supposed, that your intrinsic character could remain hid from the eye of men of experience, under the flimsy veil of your sectarian zeal; and that they would not perceive the "Cæsar aut Nihil" was your motto. While men of sense will readily discern the ambition of your projects, those of the most common placed ability, in business calculation, will be enabled to furnish themselves with conclusive testimony, that by the publication of your Debates on baptism, and your *mere sounding* "Christian Baptist," you wheedle the Baptists, and others of the community, out of as much money as would cover the salary of nine out of ten, at least, of the Baptist ministers.

I shall here enter into a brief calculation of the pecuniary advantages resulting to you from your publications. In the first place then, we have your first Debate upon Baptism, in a volume of about 200 pages. Of this book, I should say that its publication did not stand you more than 37 1-2 cents per volume. This I say with the fullest conviction that it is a fact, unless you choose to pay extra prices for the work, which is not likely to have been the case. As a particular evidence for the correctness of the foregoing assertion, I may observe, that about the same time you published your first Debate on Baptism, I was interested in the publication of a book, altogether superior in materials to yours, of 360 pages, and that did but cost 45 cents per volume; add to this, my book was published in a part of the country, where the price of labour and material for making up a book is 33 1-3 per cent. more than it is in Ohio, where you published your first Debate—For the said first Debate you charged 75 cents. In the publication of your second Debate, I take upon me to say that *you did*, or that you could have published it at an expense not exceeding 50 cents per volume: and for that your price to your *friends* is $1 25. The number of copies that you had printed of the first was 2000, and you sold the copy-right for 300 dollars. I will suppose that the whole of both debates will be sold by the middle of the year eighteen hundred and twenty-five. From this data we shall have the following exhibit to give of the case—

Dr. *Publication of Debate on Baptism.* *Cr.*

To 2000 copies of Debate with Mr. Walker, at 37 1-2 per copy.	750 00	By 2000 copies of Debate with Mr. Walker, at 75 cents per copy,	1500 00
To 6500 copies of Debate with M'Calla, at 50 cents, per copy,	3250 00	By sales of 6500 copies of Debate with M'Calla, at 1 25 per copy,	8125 00
To incidental expenses of distributing said Debate, including contingent losses, say 12 1-2 cents per volume.	1062 50	By sale of copy-right of Debate with Mr. Walker,	300 00
To Balance	4862 50		9925 00
	$9925 00	*By Balance*	$4862 50

Now, sir, it appears that you have made the sum of 5000 dollars, within a fraction, clear profit, when your books are disposed of; this we suppose will be done by the middle of the ensuing year, at which time there will have been five years elapsed since the debate with Mr. Walker. This will show, that you have been writing and preaching and debating upon the ordinance of Baptism, (a scrap of our faith,) without any *inducement* whatever, but *your zeal for the Baptists and regard for the truth, excepting, the mere sum of 1000 dollars per annum; which in the western country, where you live, is equal to 2000 dollars in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore!* Where did this money come from? did it not come principally from the Baptists? it did, nor have they had *any better value for it than you suppose them to receive by sending their dollars to convert the Laplander or the Hindoos.* So much, sir, by way of redeeming our pledge, to prove that you are not the *disinterested* champion for the truth that you profess to be—that your eye sometimes is directed to the glittering cliffs of Potosi. It is perfectly *natural*, sir, that you should attempt to persuade every body, that you are governed by no sordid motives in any thing that you do: but really sir, it is "passing strange" that

men should be so credulous as to believe you, with such facts staring them in the face: it shows that they are prone to "swallow without pause or choice, the total grist unsifted, husks and all," so that it is sweetened with a little adulation, of their *civic*, their *moral*, their *intellectual worth*. We shall say nothing at present about your "Christian Baptist," as being a source of revenue to you; if you have, however, even a thousand subscribers, for that, I will undertake to prove, that you clear 300 dollars by it per annum; and even *that sum is more than nine out of ten of the Baptist ministers of these western states get per annum;* perhaps I might be safe in saying, that it is *twice as much as they receive*. What! envy them a paltry $150, when you get 10 to 1300 dollars—what, deem them overpaid by 150 dollars, who preach all the glorious truths of the gospel, and who labour incessantly to inspire spiritual life and universal holiness into the church, when you receive 10 to $1300 for mere disquisition upon an outward ordinance! or things allied to it! Nor does it escape observation, that you are giving evidence, that you consider the present stage of your operations but the mere seed time in pecuniary results, that you calculate, e'er long, on throwing a considerable part of the religious community around you into such a state of anarchy, as to make any kind of order that you may dictate desirable. In such an event you would know, no doubt, how to fix your price for your interference. You have, no doubt, a full account of all *costs*. Here let me say, sir, that while from my soul I abhor all extravagance, luxury, and covetousness in the ministers of the gospel, as much as you, or any other man can, on the other hand I must say, that the manner in which you declaim against all pecuniary compensation to the ministers of the gospel, proves, in itself, without refering to many other evidences that exist, that you are absolutely ignorant of the essential relationship subsisting between the pastor after God's own heart, and the flock of the Lord Jesus Christ, and as a man, destitute of the spirit of the living God, who alone can give adaptation to the office of the ministry; or indeed, make one jot or tittle of efficient application of the salvation of Christ to the human soul; as such a man it would be a futile attempt on my part, to furnish your mind with any just perceptions on that subject. Till God the Holy Ghost does it, the subject in any and every form of language, would appear but foolishness in your eyes. All this remark, a spiritual people and a spiritual minister, know to be true, to whatever denomination they may belong; and you may as soon expect to allure the living to the embrace of a putrescent carcass, as to draw the "Israelite indeed," the truly lively and devotional believer, from the pastor of his choice, to such a character as you are among ministers.

The next thing we shall refer to of our remarks, is, the effort you are making to render obsolete all forms of faith and church order. In this attempt of yours we must positively consider you a fool, or designing to disorganize, and overthrow all social compact in the religious community. We have already expressed our conviction, that it results from your design to produce anarchy; that in the end you may dictate what shall be *faith and order, and your own terms for which that shall be done.* We may pause, to decide whether there should be pity or indignation felt toward you. Certainly you ought not to calculate upon offering such an insult to the understanding of sensible men in the Baptist denomination, as is found in your proposition to lay aside their

faith and order, without expecting their contempt or their frowns; this circumstance itself demonstrates to every reflecting mind, that you are no Baptist; only after the *will of the flesh!* no, nor ever have been.

The next feature of the subject that we have brought to your view, which we shall retouch is, the *general* character of your adherents, or disciples, (teachers and pupils;) in view of which, are you not rather abashed at the motley group! teachers advancing sentiments and doctrines one day, that they gainsay another—acknowledging that they had been for years instructing others in the gospel of Christ, while disbelieving the very fundamentals of it themselves; and even in the concession of their ignorance themselves in the past, giving no jot or tittle of evidence, that they even now believe in, or feel the truths they have been ignorant of. Teachers, of whose views no definite opinion can be formed, by learned or unlearned; whose hearers say, alternately, that they are Antinomians, Sandemanians, or Socinians, and in the aggregate, that they cannot tell what they say, or know whereof they affirm: while their immediate adherents say, away with all forms of faith and order; we be freemen; we will read and think, and judge for ourselves—our Elder thinks one thing, we another—we had such and such views yesterday—today we have different ones—and to-morrow we calculate upon having opinions at variance with all we have heretofore entertained: this they call the liberty of the gospel—a mark of mental independence—the evidence of their *growing in the knowledge of Scriptures.* They profess to feel great satisfaction in reading the Bible, to have much peace and joy in their attainments of knowledge. Now, the truth is, that in every stage of their experience, the pride of their minds, the vanity of their hearts, being gratified, is the sole cause of their satisfaction. Indeed, the whole of your fraternity, from first to last, including yourself, sir, are flatterers of each other—they say, that there is no teacher like you—you respond, there is no people so well instructed and intelligent as them. You recollect, I suppose, who "obtained a kingdom by flatteries." Bear in mind also, that it is written upon good authority, "he who speaketh flattery to his friends, even the eyes of his children shall fail"—and that the characteristic of an evangelical minister is, "not to use flattering words;" for, that is to be considered, and set down, as "a *cloak* of covetousness" after *fame or emolument*, or both. Now, it is not my wish to be understood as disapproving of all possible devotedness to the perusal of the Scriptures: on the contrary, I think your fraternity worthy of imitation in this particular; but I wish to be understood, as saying, that, *generally*, they read for no other object, and to no other end, than to grow wise in their own conceit: and you know it is written, "that there is more hope of fools," than such characters. You will, I persuade myself, look over the address to the Baptist churches appended to these letters; in that you will see some of the contrast which I conceive the real and the *spiritual* believer bears to the character of your adherents. For the present I relieve your attention, with simply observing, that it was not for your sake that I have made a recapitulation of my former remarks in this last letter, but for the sake of those whose minds may not be so well disciplined in recollection, as yours.

A REGULAR BAPTIST.

N. B. I shall trouble you with a few lines more, rather than swell the last letter to greater dimensions.

Sir,

In view of what I have exhibited of your character, from the fairest ground of conjecture, and from the face of your doings, since you have been a *professed* Baptist, together with the notification, that the same estimate is formed of you by far the greatest, if not all the really *spiritual* and intelligent part of the Baptists that have knowledge of you; from these circumstances combined, I say, one might hope, that you will fall a little from the loftiness of your self-complacency. Perhaps, in the reminiscences which the consideration of the subject will produce, the language of the prophet may come up to your mind, where he says, "Thy terribleness hath deceived thee, and the pride of thy heart, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, that holdest the height of the hill; though thou shouldest make thy nest as high as the eagle, I will bring thee down from thence, saith the Lord." Confident that you have an undue and deleterious influence in the Baptist church, I would wish to see it destroyed. To this end I am now writing to you; believing that nothing is necessary to the accomplishment of the object, but to rouse the minds of the Baptists around you to an investigation of your character, similar to that which I have given an outline of—"the death of reflection, is the birth of all wo;" and when churches sleep, the enemy will sow tares. Hence, *good will to the Baptist cause, and not ill will to you sir*, moves me to address these remarks to you for the public eye. I am fully persuaded, that you are every day sinking the character of the Baptist church in these western states, both in the estimation of the truly religious and irreligious. All you do, all you say, together with your satellites, is fathered upon the regular Baptist church —doctrines however horrible—practices however corrupt—observances however foolish—inconsistencies however numerous—and speculations however absurb, incongruous and versatile, that prevail in your fraternity, are all set down to the account of the Baptist denomination. Does not the blush crimson and burn your cheek, sir, when you see the mental dishonesty, the moral turpitude that is implied in the fact of your having threw around you the habiliments of a Baptist profession, to the end, that you might, unsuspectedly, propagate sentiments and doctrines directly at variance with, and disgraceful to the Baptist church! but "vengeance belongs unto God." The Lord rebuke thee in the chambers of your own conscience; then you will be the first to acknowledge, that of such character, and such conduct it may be truly said, "O full of all subtlety, thou child of the devil, will thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord." I assure you, that I entertain no idea of moral superiority over and above you by nature; that in an unregenerated state, I know myself capable of practising all the trick and manœuvre that you have been practising, to get a name in the world; that the pride of the human heart in its native language, is in accordance with Satan's, when he says, "better to reign in hell than serve in heaven." The principle that appears chiefly to govern you, is, what the world, in its severest judgment, calls "the infirmity of a noble spirit;" but then, you must not be surprised if others should feel somewhat indignant while suffering under the devastating freaks of that "noble spirit;" or, if they raise a warning voice to their neighbours of its presence, particularly when it comes dressed in long and flowing Phylacteries with disinterested zeal—universal reformation—absolute equality—and consummate perfection written thereon.

You are, sir, *a citizen of America;* and as such, free to worship God after the dictates of your own conscience, to profess to believe, or not believe, in any, or every part of the Bible—to advance whatever doctrines you please in the community, unless in hostility to the known laws of the land. *But you are not at liberty, sir, to profess a connexion with any religious denomination when you are advancing doctrines diametrically opposite to theirs.* What head of a religious family is there in the community, but would feel indignant, were you to enter his house, and having gained some general ideas of his family affairs, go forth into the world, and make use of that information as an evidence, that you were his son, or otherwise nearly related to him! and how would his indignation be increased if he found, that you were passing yourself off as his son, while living in the practice of theatrical buffooneries, or any other kind of habits at variance with that respectability of himself and family, which you were refering to, and making use of, to command attention from, and influence with others! certainly, every man would conceive you deserving of rebuke for taking such unjustifiable liberties with his good name: indeed, it would be fairly considered as the worst species of robbery—and can similar conduct be more authorised because it is practised on a large body? certainly not—and here is the particular point upon which I found all my reason for considering you deserving of public exposure. Come forth, sir, to our view, what you really are! but not as a genuine Baptist—for you now are, and have been, trying to overthrow the faith, the order and the ministry of that for years past. Come out then, sir, in your real character, and with your real sentiments—tell us candidly, that you do not believe in what we *emphatically* denominate regeneration, or in the Spirit's special influences at all—tell us, that you consider a man eligible to baptism without one word of inquiry as to what God has done for his soul, and upon his *bare* declaration that he *believes*—tell us, that you do not believe the moral law of God to be a rule of life for the believer!—tell us, that you do not believe that preaching the gospel since the completion of New Testament revelation has the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ—tell us, that you have no fellowship with any forms of faith or church discipline—tell us, that you have no confidence in the exercise of prayer, as a means of grace, or, estimation of it, as a believer's privilege: and that, *in proof thereof, you have been entirely neglectful of it even in your own family for years past*—tell us these things openly, declare them explicitly, *and merit the name of a candid man.* You are at full liberty, and under positive obligation to do so. You will then give the public a reasonable pledge, that you are governed by no sinister, nor improper motives. The Baptist denomination will then be answerable for the palpable inconsistency of holding connexion with a man whose sentiments are in direct opposition to that faith and order which they hold up to public view, as the foundation of their spiritual hope, and bond of their visible existence. Had you done this, sir, at a proper time, no one would have had any cause to reproach you; and multitudes who now shun you as a *deceiver*, would have been pleased to have met with you upon principles of ordinary intercourse, and interchanged the feelings of social amity—among whom, sir, I assure you with the utmost sincerity and truth, I may mention myself; believing as I do, that as a natural man, you have a good share of those attractions of mind and manners, which beguile the tedium of life, and smooth its rugged path. Before I close, indulge me with permission to repeat, that my

own judgment dictates solely and wholly, in this address to you: that if my wretched heart does not deceive me, I have had the best of motives in endeavouring to pourtray your character, as being opposite to what you profess it to be, under the name of a Baptist! Upon a review of what I have written, I do not think any injustice is done to the subject. I am sensible, however, that infirmities will ever characterize me in all I attempt to do while in the flesh; and that iniquity belongs to my most holy things. I have endeavoured to write with death, eternity and judgment before my eyes; and to keep up an earnest desire and prayer in my soul, that I might not unnecessarily inflict any wound upon your feelings, or that of any other person. You are, sir, and all whom I have adverted to as like you, in these letters, my fellow man, fellow immortal, and fellow sinner. If you and they are under the fatal mistake, and in the awful darkness that I believe you to be, the foregoing address may be made use of, by that God who delights to make use of the weakest things to accomplish the greatest of purposes, to your essential benefit; as I hope he will to the benefit of his people in the Baptist church, where your influence is felt. At all events, I feel satisfied, that my soul is big with inexpressible desire, that you and all who drink into your particular views in religion, may realize the overshadowing and indwelling power of the Holy Ghost, who only can make an effectual and saving application of the name of the Lord Jesus Christ to your precious souls. I now take my leave of you, sir, after informing you that my real name I wish to conceal in reference to this publication; not that I want to avoid any responsibility connected with what I have written. No; *my name is at your service through the medium of the printer hereof*, when you may think proper to demand it in propria persona; provided, you give a fair reason for having it communicated to you. I have not written to you without counting the costs. It has been severely painful to my feelings while speaking in any respect harshly to you—but, sir, you have struck, and are striking at my faith. "'Tis my glory, the lifter up of my head" from every billow of affliction—yea, more, 'tis the glory of the Baptist denomination. And well it may be; for without any qualification, it makes *Jesus Christ all and in all of the sinner's hope;* it gives to the adorable *three in one, their respective, proper and full share in the salvation of the elect.* Moreover, many of that denomination, together with myself, not only charge you with attacking our faith, (this had it been done openly we could, we must have borne) but it has been done *insidiously* by you. "There's the rub:" this consideration, perhaps, has roused more resentment in writing to you than I ought to have felt. But in perfect coolness I now tell you in my concluding sentence, *that my pen is but the echo of ten thousand voices when I say, that you ought to be divested of the name of "the Christian Baptist," and known by that of "the Theological adventurer."*

A REGULAR BAPTIST.

To the regular Baptist Churches, scattered throughout the Western Section of the United States.

BRETHREN, BELOVED OF THE LORD,

As many of you as read the foregoing letters to Alexander Campbell will, I hope, be disposed, in justice to him and to yourselves, to give every possible investigation to the subject of which it treats; and like the noble Bereæans, "search if these things be so." Yes, brethren, search, search his whole life as far as possible; it is high time he should be fully known to you, for he is either your very zealous, though ignorant advocate, and therefore wants your Aquila's and Priscilla's to direct his zeal according to knowledge, or he is an enemy in disguise and ought to be exposed. You cannot, brethren, but, perceive, upon a most common-place notice of this man's life, since he has been among you, that you, as a denomination, have been made the citadel of his safety, while throwing the shafts of his hostility at other denominations; particularly at that one with which you most assuredly stand in the greatest degree of fellowship.

The question then is, whether Mr. C. represents *your feelings* towards the Presbyterian and other Pædo-baptist churches, against whom he "breathes out threatenings and slaughter?" if he does, let us know what cause they have given for this interminable rage. But I need not put this sort of question to you, being fully persuaded that your greatest partiality is towards that very church which Mr. C appears to hate with the most deadly hatred. It is but reasonable that it should be so; for with all their *spots and imperfections*, they approach the nearest to what is your glory as a denomination, I mean *experimental religion and solid piety*. Perhaps, brethren, you are indulging yourselves in a little *merriment*, by allowing Mr. C. to go out in your name to challenge, and even attack, with his single arm, the formidable phalanx of the Pædo-baptist churches. Indeed, brethren, apart from other considerations, and it is really *amusing*. You have an exhibit of the freaks which human vanity can play, and how it can make a man fancy himself a Hercules, and push him forth in quest of adventures for his prowess, when indeed, he is but a pigmy; and that he can draw out from the deep leviathan, with a hook that his own fingers have fashioned. But, brethren, you will, I hope, seriously reflect, that the animosity which Mr. C. exhibits towards the Pedo-baptists, will be regarded, at least very generally, as your feelings towards them, so long as he shall have a name and place among you. Think, I say, seriously, of that brethren, and judge you, whether it is not taking away from you the *ornament* of a meek and quiet spirit! if it is not getting you the character of a tribe of Ishmaelites, whose hand is against every one, rather than the name of a church of the Lord Jesus Christ, walking in the fear of God, *the comfort of the Holy Ghost*, and living peaceably with all men. Then, the next question is, will you indulge your humour, or gratify the vanity of Mr. C. at the expense of that good name of yours, which has been like ointment poured forth? besides, brethren, you may rely upon it, that no man, much less any body of men, ever familiarized themselves even to the fighting of *dung-hill cocks*, or *little surly curs*, but what found themselves gradually warmed up to fighting tempera-

ment! hence, saith the wise man, in the maturity of wisdom, "leave off contention before it be meddled with; cast out the scorner and contention will cease." Now, brethren, the proposition I have just advanced, is known to be true to every one of any observation on human life. It was by the exhibition of different kinds of fighting among beasts and men, that *ambitious demagogues and wily politicians* of old, were wont to brutalize the feelings, and render ferocious the disposition of the common people, to the end, that they might be prepared for all manner of violence and rapacity that their leaders might see fit to direct them to. You will understand, that these demagogues pretended to have *only the pleasure and amusement* of their fellow-citizens in view, in the exhibitions alluded to. Now, the same or similar causes will always produce similar effects. It makes no difference where the contention goes on; in church or state, in city or family: when men see contention and fighting, as we said, they begin to wax warm on different sides of the fray—the breath quickens, the pulse doubles, the eye rolls, the hands clinch, the fist smites, almost unconsciously to themselves. *Ah, and this Mr. C. knows right well too; and having had you for two or three years spectators of his own personal combats, or familiarized your minds to a view of his own fightings, you will find, perhaps too late, that the object contemplated by Mr. C. was to prepare you for dissentions and fightings among yourselves; to the end, that he might share the spoils by making you a divided people.* Already, brethren, it is to be feared, that many of you are much more ambitious to make it known, that you have a variety of Greek prepositions, Latin verbs, and Hebrew roots *in your heads*, than the *incorruptible seed* of divine truth *abiding in your hearts.* Already many of you are disposed to contend more for the faith once delivered to the saints, in *noisy, empty words*, than by *a well ordered life, and a holy conversation.* Is this not the case? or if you refuse to answer that question, at least, brethren, solemnly and prayerfully inquire of your souls, individually before God, soul! soul! of what profit to thee is the spleen and declamation of Alexander Campbell or any other man against any body of people? does, or can it ever add one jot or tittle to the spiritual prosperity of the church to which I belong? If it is evident that no benefit results from attention thereto, it is certainly both foolish and wicked to have the fleeting moments of our fleeting lives, occupied therewith: then, brethren, if you do not wish to have Mr. C's animosity towards other denominations chargeable to you, *you must learn him to be quiet.*

You have, brethren, in your church, a justly regulated observance of the only two ordinances of divine appointment in the New Testament dispensation, binding in common upon all the disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ; they are Baptism and the Lord's Supper. *Before any person* is entitled to the first, you professedly believe, that "he must be born again:"—born of the adorable Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ; or to use the apostle's strong and comprehensive language upon the subject, he *must* experience "the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" that to baptize any one who does not *give evidence of this change of heart*, (not a change merely in the head,) is awful presumption, abominable blasphemy, and a deed of darkness, which is emphatically to mimick the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. Now, brethren, the next inquiry is, whether or no *Mr. C. has ever given evidence that he is a regenerated man?* if he has not, then you must necessarily consider him an

"evil tree," and you know, upon good authority, that "an evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit," neither towards God nor man, spiritually. You may as soon, and as reasonably, expect to gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles, as any real and spiritual benefit from the services of an unregenerate man; be they ever so numerous and extensive, they will all amount to nothing more, as respects the Church of Christ, than the many things which Herod did. Now, I say solemnly, and in the fear of God, that there is great, if not *unqualified* reason to conclude, that Mr. C. is an unregenerated man. The reasons for my believing so you will have seen in the preceding letters addressed to him. One solitary circumstance, however, of the many which I have noticed as evidence of his unregeneracy, is all that I deem necessary to settle the point with you; that is, there is every reason to conclude from his writings and *orations*, together with the general sentiments of his adherents, *that he does not so much as believe in the Spirit's immediate influences upon the soul, in the first, or any following stage of the believer's life.*

I know, brethren, that it is said, with some degree of plausibility, that there is reason for suspending judgment on Mr. C. in that respect, because many good meaning people are *held in doubt; alternately believing that he does, or that he does not acknowledge a belief in the doctrines alluded to.* O! heavens! and has it come to this pass, that Baptist churches will suffer themselves to wait six or eight years to learn whether or not one of their professed ministers believes in the Holy Ghost, as the mighty, special and direct agency of all efficient conversion in the human soul! What next? wait six or eight years to ascertain whether or not some other of their ministers believes in the Divinity or Godhead of Jesus Christ! What next? wait six or eight years to inquire whether or not some other of their ministers acknowledge the being of a God! What next? wait to the end of our lives to know whether or not we are to have any *part of our faith admitted as the truth;* and quietly sink into hell while in the attitude of humbly waiting upon Mr. C. and other innovators, for something which *they may call believing.* It ought not to be a matter of question for one moment, with any regular Baptist, or any real and spiritual christian, as to who and what that man is, who, as a minister of the gospel, even neglects to preach the doctrine of the new birth by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. No, nor will it be a matter of question with any intelligent spiritual christian, of whatever denomination they may be! they will one and all pronounce him to be an unregenerated man, and an impostor. We repeat, that there is no necessity of his saying in so many words, *he don't believe in it;* if he does not *preach it, he virtually denies it,* and ought to be estimated accordingly! The devil, brethren, is never so dangerous, as when he assumes the form of an angel of light, and comes into the churches with great *profession of zeal for ordinances, and some part of the truth:* but not *the whole truth.* You will recollect, the Lord Jesus Christ has admonished us, that not every one that even says *Lord! Lord!* unto him, shall enter the kingdom of heaven: as if he had said, you already know, that he who denies me to be the Lord Jehovah, has no saving knowledge of me. I now tell you what shall surprise you

more, that there shall be many that shall give me every name of honour and distinction, as God over all, who, nevertheless shall not enter into heaven. Brethren, if the Devil was to be permitted his choice of devices against the Baptist churches, I should expect it to be exhibited in a *flaming zeal for their ordinances, and earnest vociferation of the name of Christ, as Lord, Lord.* He knows that they love the ordinances, and are delighted to hear the name of Jesus exalted. Under these circumstances, suppose him to select an instrument for the infliction of some disastrous injury upon you: it would be of an individual of the best outside appearance, and one that would have the most untiring zeal for the minutia of your faith, as the Pharisees of old had for mint, rue, and cummin; in your attention to which, he would praise and commend you above all others, and insensibly lift up your minds in pride, and a disposition to measure and compare yourselves with those around you; contrary to the command given us to know no man after the flesh, but to judge, if we would judge correctly, by the fruit of the spirit; which is, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance. He would be full of exclamation of "Lord, Lord, we prophecy in thy name:" that is, not denying the eternal power and God head of Jesus Christ, but readily acknowledging him to be the King of kings, and Lord of lords; the Almighty's Fellow, and Father's equal; Creator, Upholder, final Judge, and Disposer of all worlds; together, with the admission of his being the end of sin, by the sacrifice of himself, and the Lord, our everlasting righteousness. Here, however, he would stop; having charmed your ears with these great swelling words, and words without knowledge, he would have you to repose upon these abstract truths; because all these things you might hear, and read, and historically believe, to the end of your lives, and be damned as certainly as Satan himself is! *Wherever there is a ministry that stops here, you may rely upon it, that there is a devil in, and destruction following it—it is Satan transformed into an angel of light—it is hell moving to deceive, and make a prey of the human soul, in its master stroke of machination.* To accomplish that, it will be no marvel if the Devil, *in some instances*, gives up all reference to *pecuniary considerations;* particularly, if it is likely to give his doings the greater appearance of good intentions. However, he generally makes a liberal compensation to his agents, in some way or other: and if he does not permit them to touch the fleece of the sheep, he will, perhaps, give them *a fat flourishing ewe from the goat-herd.*

But to return to the subject immediately before us: and, of all such ministry, we must say, that it is but an illustration of the words of the Lord Jesus Christ already quoted; namely, "not every one that saith Lord, Lord unto me shall enter into the kingdom of heaven." No, brethren, we profess to believe, that God the Holy Ghost, only, can make a saving application of the gospel of Christ to our souls, by its immediate, enlightening and regenerating influences: that, without this, the gospel is but a dead letter. We profess to believe, that the adorable Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is the great, the glorious, the soul refreshing promise of the *New*, as Jesus Christ was the promise of the Old Testament. What think you then of the man, as a minister in your denomination, who *never preaches this doctrine?* What to

best, is all equivocation in his remarks upon it? and who, in truth, does not believe in it? are you going to call *such a one*, brother! can you, as *ministers* and people, *possibly consider yourselves at liberty*, to welcome to your churches, and place in your pulpits, a man entertaining such sentiments as these? a man, that will tell you, there is no spirit to regenerate and quicken in righteousness; no Holy Ghost for those who ask it of God: no comforter for the saints now: no spirit to make intercession for them with groanings which are unutterable; or, to bear *witness* with their spirits, that they are the *children* of God; and to seal them heirs of heaven. O! brethren, what a rent is here made in the rock of your salvation! the heavens become shrouded, the sun of righteousness is hid from your eyes, the stars of glory's firmament vanish from your view. What cruelty, injustice and fraud is there contained in the attempt to fill your hearts with unbelief in this glorious doctrine. I repeat, that it is the master stroke of hell's machinations against your souls! that as many of you as indulge in any such sentiments, you have reason to consider yourselves reprobates; and that if you die in this state, you must inevitably be damned. So, then, you were under delusion, when you thought, that God the Holy Ghost convinced you of sin, of righteousness, and judgment to come; when you saw and *felt*, your hearts all deceitfulness and desperately wicked; when you were broken and contrite in spirit; when you felt your souls to draw nigh unto the grave, and your lives to the destroyers. You were under a delusion, then, when you thought that God, by the Holy Ghost, gave you the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness. You have been under a delusion, then, in the thousand instances wherein you thought, that you found fellowship with the Father and Son, and communion with the Holy Ghost. You have been mistaken when you have thought that at a throne of grace, in prayer and supplication, God has lifted your souls from a sea of trouble to a peace that passed all understanding; from awful wretchedness, to joy unspeakable. You have been mistaken too, when reading the Scriptures, you thought you saw, in a moment, a glory, and fulness, and loveliness, in the salvation of the cross; and through the *august agency of the Holy Ghost*, that surpassed the power of language to describe, and greater than you could ever have acquired, through a life of ten thousand years, unoperated upon by that Spirit who reveals the things that belong unto Christ. You then, and all the precious souls, of those highly intellectual, gifted, holy and spiritual men whose memories are embalmed in hymns, and psalms, and spiritual songs, as well as other impressive, soothing, sanctifying writings; you, I say, and they, have all been under a delusion, a phantasy of the brain; *for Mr. C. says so.* Ah! Mr. C's. master is a bold and imprudent accuser: he had the audacity to tell the Almighty to his face, that he did not believe in his servant Job's *experience*; neither in that of "Joshua and his fellows," whom he followed to heaven, *to deride and accuse as fanatics.* And you, my brethren, are to expect Satan, and all unregenerated men, to treat your *holy things* as swine treat pearl. "The natural man understandeth not the things of the spirit, for they are foolishness to him: neither indeed, can he understand them, for they are spiritually discerned." He may nevertheless, talk and write with as much volubility, energy of language, and splendour of conception, about the Lord Jesu Christ, as did Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar, converse with Job about the Al-

mighty. Yet they could never say, with Job, that they knew "their Redeemer lived." And in the end, Jehovah rebuked them for their *empty declamation* about himself; and his wrath fell upon them while he told them, "ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath." Job *felt* that he knew the Almighty, *for he had his spirit in his soul.* The others were full of confidence, that they knew Jehovah as well as Job! *but the latter knew they were deceived.* And God made it manifest they were so in the end. Parallell to this, is the case between those who have, and those who have not the spirit of God in these days. They may both talk or write equally well, in a certain degree, of Christ; but those who have the spirit will know that the other is blind, when he says he sees, and sinking to hell when professing to be soaring to heaven. Of the latter character, I feel but too much afraid Mr. C. is. But you will make it I hope, a subject of due enquiry: and if it is so, will you, can you, dare you profess fellowship with such a man? will you suffer him to blaspheme the Holy Ghost (for it is nothing less than blasphemy) by preaching to you in the name of Jesus Christ, without reference to the glorious office of that adorable Spirit, in the economy of salvation? alas! so far as you do so, it is ominous of the most fearful and disastrous consequences to your unity, peace, and spiritual prosperity. Whatever may be the scene of trial, of confusion, and of temporary sacrifice of your personal feelings; you are called upon, by every consideration of fealty to Jesus Christ, of obedience to his precepts, of honour for his gospel, of regard for his cause, and the welfare of Zion, as well as respect for your personal religion, to tear off and cast from you, as a deadly viper, every individual infested with those desolating sentiments.

You will, I say again, it is to be hoped, make proper inquiry upon the subject before you. You will not only find the heterodoxy we have mentioned, to be chargeable to Mr. C. but that many of his fraternity, who are less wary and intelligent, have in many instances, the effrontery to laugh at, and make derision of your professedly, and really *essential experience* as christians. The broken and contrite spirit, the new heart, the disquieted and cast down soul, the groaning intercessions, the fears within and fightings without; together, with all that proves you to be of the number of God's people, whom he has "chosen in the furnace of affliction," and who "have fellowship with the Lord Jesus Christ in his sufferings;" all this is considered by them, as the price of a misguided and distempered brain. So, also, are the opposite circumstances in your new and spiritual life; wherein, you have refreshings from the presence of the Lord when his candle shines bright upon your tabernacle; when you feel that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, that he is imbuing all your thoughts, and affections, with the constituents of his own glorious kingdom; whereof is joy unspeakable, peace that passeth all understanding of the unregenerate mind, love to God, all vehement and devouring; views of the adorable person, and work of Christ, as mediator unutterably ravishing and glorious; and under which views, your souls become clothed with humility, meekness, gentleness, patience, and all the bright hues that characterize the "garments of salvation." All these things, in the history of your life of *faith* are estimated, and spoken of, by these formalists, as was the power and influences of the Holy Ghost, through the instrumentality of Christ and his Apostles, spoken of by the Jews. In the latter case, there was a sinning against the Holy Ghost, for which there was no forgiveness; and in the former case, it may be said, "Be-

hold, ye despisers, and wonder and *perish:* for I work a work in your day, a work in which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you." Mr. C. and his followers do not believe in this work! therefore, "they shall all likewise perish;" unless that spirit, against whom they are doing despite, shall make them wise to salvation. Brethren, I have dwelt longer upon the subject, than I contemplated to do; but its vital importance to a *saving* knowledge of Jesus Christ, will justify all my remarks. Indeed, take it away from the Baptist church, and I would as soon have connexion with a body of Socinians, or a club of Deists, as with them. The question returns; is Mr. C. and his followers chargeable with such views as we have stated? and if they are, well may we exclaim with Jacob of old, (Jacob, brethren, was an Israelite, *indeed*—the first of all the Israelites: and what made him an Israelite? prayer! noon-day, midnight, fervent, effectual prayer! are you Israelites, indeed!!) "O my soul come not thou into their secret; and unto their assembly mine honour be thou not united."

Brethren, I shall occupy but little more of your time, having had your attention to what I consider the great, the conclusive and absolute evidence, that Mr. C. and those who think like him, are unregenerated people. And I have yet to learn, that any body of people, calling themselves a regular Baptist church, ever admitted, that an unregenerate man was fit material for church-fellowship, much less to be a minister of the church of Christ. With an aspirant after worldly fame, however, with one who would be the founder of some new sect in religion, the character of the material of which it is to be formed, will be of secondary consideration. The first and important point will be, to get the material, and then follows the work of bringing it together and giving it some semblance to the Church of Christ To the mind of the real and *spiritual* Christian, however, all those imitations of the work of God, the Holy Ghost, will bear no more resemblance to the reality, than does the clumsy, half human, half brute idol of the Hindoo, to the beauty of a well proportioned man.

Brethren, let me beseech you, by the mercies of God, again to ask yourselves, individually, and as churches, if Mr. C's. controversies about baptism, have done you any real service? if they have made, *one thought more holy! one affection more spiritual! one moment of your lives more heavenly and happy!* Did Mr C's. preaching to you ever humble, and abase, and empty you, to the end, that you might learn, experimentally, (not speculatively or notionally) the fulness treasured up in Christ. O, did it ever make you *feel*, (not merely think or say) that you are nothing, and that Christ is all in all. Does he by his *orations*, or writings, clothe your minds with solemnity, fill your hearts with *hungerings and thirstings after righteousness;* expand your breasts in *mighty supplications* to the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ, *by day and by night;* wean you from the world, and make your conversation to be in heaven, in a word, has he ever done any thing to diffuse *the power of Godliness in your hearts* as individuals? to promote your *peace, unity, and spiritual fellowship* as churches? or your essential beauty and glory as a denomination, by making you *conspicuous* among the sects in the christian world, in *holiness unto the Lord*, and not in mere talkativeness and vain contention with men. On the contrary, has not his verbose disputations about the ordinance of baptism, been of serious injury to you individually, by making you think more highly of yourselves than you ought to think; and by lessening your *prayerful* attention to

essential faith, hope and charity—"to the things that accompany salvation," and that make the possessor meek and lowly in heart. Does not his preaching leave upon your minds the conviction, that he addresses you exactly upon the same principle, and to the same end, that an attorney speaks for his client, or that an office hunter harangues at the hustings! that is that he may "rise to shine"—that he may appear great by putting all others below his own level, Yes, brethren, you know, that however much Mr. C. may have amused, or even informed your minds by his preaching, he never was the means of sending any of you in Godly sorrow to a throne of grace ;he never made you humble nor self-a-based, nor comforted your souls when "enduring the fight of affliction," in which, and to which, it hath pleased God to choose his truly believing people. Instead of this, brethren, he has attempted to rob you of the only "comforter"; that you can possibly have in this life of tribulation—I mean, the adorable, the condescending Holy Ghost, without whose influences, your souls will become *impoverished and lean, your minds vain and arrogant, your hearts hard and impenitent.* O, brethren, hell triumphs most fearfully over you, if any of you have given up your belief in the spirit's influences. God grant that it may not be to demonstrate that you are reprobates; but, to teach you how foolish, and how beast-like you were in giving heed, for one moment, to the blasting, withering, damning doctrines of innovators upon the faith of God's elect. You know, brethren, that there is a veil upon the hearts of the Jews, so that they cannot understand the coming of the "Son of man," though he is the great burthen of all the ceremonies and prophecies of the Old Testament, and though the very *day* of his being "cut off for the sins of the people" is therein predicted. Yet these Scriptures they always have, and do continue to read incessantly. Exactly similar is the case with Mr. C. and those that think as he does, in reference to the New Testament! those that do not receive the spirit's influences, are no more benefitted by reading the *New*, than the Jews are in reading the Old Testament. They might both read to eternity and be still in darkness! or, as an Apostle says, "ever learning, and never able to come to a knowldge of the truth." *Six million of Jews, however, are ready to rise up and declare that they do understand the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and that the Messiah is not yet come.* But this only shows how blind and deluded are their minds; and that they are capable of asserting, and even *swearing* to a lie. And if six million of Campbellites, or more properly speaking, Glassites and Sandeminians, were to swear that there was no Holy Ghost now, to operate specially, and immediately upon the human soul, it must only be considered as an evidence, that they were equally as blind and wretched in their spiritual condition as the Jews! ah, *and just as consistent and pious would it be, for professors of religion to go to a synagogue to learn gospel truth, as to an assembly of the Sandeminians, or those denying the doctrine of the spirit's influence!*

But I have digressed, and no wonder, for the subject to which I unintentionally returned, is so awfully and essentially important, that I could write the same things to you about it a thousand times, if, peradventure, I might succeed in stirring up your pure minds to a proper concern about it. I was saying, that Mr. C. in his preaching or writings makes *you not more holy, more humble, more heavenly minded, or spiritual:* but, as numbers of you have told me, he appears to darken counsel by words without knowledge! he con-

fuses and perplexes your minds! he disquiets your souls! troubles your hearts, and causes you to call in question all that the blessed Spirit of your dear Jesus has done for your precious souls! so that you have been led to *abandon your closet devotions, your family prayers, and all hope of keeping up a holy and sensible communion with your God.* Alas! this is "making havoc of the churches" indeed! The cruelties of Saul of Tarsus were tender mercies compared to this. Flee then, "ye prisoners of hope," flee from this *plague, pestilence and famine*, that is stalking forth in your churches! turn to the strong holds of God's elect, *the salvation of your souls through sanctification of the Spirit*, and belief of the truth! this is the strong hold, this is the only hope of every true believer, of his ever being made mete for the inheritance of the saints in light. By this he feels sensible, that "the love of God is shed abroad in his heart," and without this he knows that all men would lie, if they said they loved God, or knew any thing of his love in their own souls! Again, brethren, *is not Mr. C. attempting to destroy your confidence in your ministers, and to have you lay aside your church order and discipline?* What is this for? Suppose for a moment that you have done it, and we will soon shew you the object in view. Well, all is still! Mr. C. has commanded, and the Baptist churches around him have silenced their ministers; they have threw away their discipline; they are one and all searching the scripture for themselves. Nobody but Mr. C. dare put a foot, or move a tongue among them as a minister. But there soon appears some difference of sentiment: the low murmur and muttering of contention is heard! *Mr. C. has calculated upon this: he knows, that it must arise: he secretly fosters and promotes it: it grows, it rises, it rages to such a calamitous extent, that at last it is agreed on all sides to refer the differences to Mr. C. that he shall be umpire; and that rather than endure such feud and confusion, they will submit to whatever Mr. C. may say is faith and order.* And thus he becomes your rabbi, your master, your pope, your antichrist. There—*that is what Mr. C. is after*, or something nearly allied to it. And I challenge the whole history of mankind, in their political, social, and domestic compact, to prove, that that must be what Mr. C. or any other man designs, when either shall make a proposition to cast away *known principles of union, and rules of order among any body of men.* I say, I appeal to the whole history of mankind through past ages, and to every living person around us, of sense and observation, to prove, that such a proposition must be coupled with the design specified, or that the proposition itself must come from a fool! but Alexander Campbell is not a fool—ergo, Alexander Campbell's design must be as above represented. Brethren, with such a proposition before you, a proposition to surrender your faith, your ministry, your discipline, you ought to rise in holy indignation, and respond—"No, sir, we shall not trifle with our own souls, 'nor with the militant existence of our denomination in this manner! The 'glorious sum and substance of the gospel scheme of salvation is found spread 'out incidentally through the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; our 'venerated and pious brethren, who have preceded us in the pilgrimage of this 'life, have brought together and embodied, all the grand outlines of that so-'vereign, finished, everlasting, special and spiritual salvation: and connected 'therewith a clear, sufficient and gospel exhibit of the discipline necessary for 'the well being of the church militant. Both have been tried, and re-tried a 'thousand times told, and compared and recompared with the scriptures in

'instances without number, and never found other than pure gold! It is only 'when it is subjetced to the moral breath of unregenerated men, that it be-'comes dim! and in this very incident, we have warning given us of the pre-'sence of impostors! we shall therefore retain our precious faith as a "mea-'suring line for that part of spiritual Jerusalem which we constitute; and our 'discipline, for those unrenewed, refractory, innovating and ambitious spirits 'which the Devil may be permitted to send in among us, to try our brother-'hood and fellowship, as well as patience and forbearance;" for, as it is writ-'ten, there must be also heresies among us, that they which are approved 'may be made manifest among us." We shall not, sir, confide in a man who 'shall make us any such proposition; we shall not gratify him by joining him 'in spouting and blowing, like so many grampus whales, against other denomi-'nations, and as if it were the whole sum of our business and happiness in this 'life. We shall not, sir, believe that man a Baptist at all, or deserving the 'name of a Baptist, who, in public, creates the spirit of general contention, 'and in private of local animosities: who would have us renounce our well 'known, clear, solid, and glorious faith, for his, which no one can define or 'understand. We will not, sir, throw ourselves into a sea of tumult and con-'fusion by giving up our discipline and order, to the end that you may have 'an opportunity to pull us out, or do something in our behalf, and to prevent 'our drowning, for which we should be compelled ever after to bow our necks 'to the yoke of your arrogant dictum, and pay you your price. We will not 'confide in the man who calls in question the general character of our minis-'ters, who serve us, for the most part, for less than what *clads* them comforta-'bly, and in many instances for less than what really hides their nakedness, 'whether of seasonable or unseasonable clothing. 'We will not support that 'man, who is evidently unable to raise himself by any intrinsic merit, and 'therefore resorts to the prostration of the character of others, that he may get 'a pedestal on which to perch his own insignificant self in ephemeral distinc-'tion. No, sir, we will do none of these things; and besides, for what would 'you have us rise with you in this hubbub of solicitude for the conversion of 'the Pædo-baptists to our order? are their ministers the designing, selfish, 'covetous, luxurious and effeminate creatures that you have represented them 'to be? and is it these characters, forsooth, that you want to bring in among 'us!! is a dipping in the water to change them? it must be you think so! or, 'you intend to bring them into our denomination *dripping* with all their exis-'tent loathsomeness! and is this, sir, your kindness, your zeal for us *!!* ah! sir, 'do not be surprised if we tell you, that suspicion of yourself begins to flitter 'o'er our minds! But you would proselyte not only ministers, but people, 'one and all, in the Pædo-baptist churches to our order. Now is it, or is it 'not true when the prophet says, "like priest, like people?" We have no 'doubt but what you, by this time, think the saying is correct; indeed your 'own writings, accord therewith: then, sir, as an additional expression of your 'loving kindness and tender mercies to the Baptist denomination, you are put-'ting forth all your energies for the purpose of proselyting the ministers and 'people of the Pædo-baptist churches to us, stinking in all that filthiness, he-'terodoxy, pride, luxury and unregeneracy, in which you have been, and still 'are holding them up to our view *!!* O, if this be an expression of your zeal, 'what must be your opposition! if this be an expression of your love, what

'would be your hatred! We have somewhere read that "the tender mercies 'of the wicked are cruelties;" and really, we think, if you did, or do mean us 'well, we are likely to have no better evidence of it than the wicked give us 'of mercy. Seriously, sir, ascertain if you are not under some similar and 'fearful mistake, in regard to your service for us, that Saul of Tarsus was 'when he thought, that by going to Damascus and *making havoc of the church*, '*he was doing God service!* Saul was quite as great, scholastic, and intellec-'tual a man as you, and yet he was subject to this awful delusion; that is, he 'denied Jesus Christ of Nazareth!—you, the Holy Ghost from heaven!—'"par nobile fratrum." Think, sir, we say, upon this subject; go down and 'tarry a little season at Jericho; at least, until you have a few scattering hairs 'of testimony for to shew us, that you are a regenerated man! As for us, sir, 'we shall proceed to make proselytes of the Paedobaptists by the use of en-'tirely different means, to what you have been using; our weapons shall not 'be carnal but spiritual, and thereby mighty to the pulling down of the strong 'holds of sin and Satan. We will, sir, *through the spirit of Christ strengthen-'ing us*, rise and shake ourselves, as a denomination, from the dust, and put 'on the beautiful garments of salvation—we will out-pray, out-labour, and 'out-love, our Paedo-baptist brethren, in the gospel of Christ; we will be 'ambitious to set them an example in all manner of Godliness, to demonstrate 'ourselves to be *holiness unto the Lord!* in unity, peace and concord among 'ourselves. This shall be the method to which we will resort, to *make* them 'take knowledge of us, that we have been with Christ and learned of him, 'that we love one another: and by which, we will compel them to inquire 'after, and adopt, every minutia of our faith. Thus we will manifest to them, 'that we have, and enjoy, the fellowship of the Father and Son, and the com-'munion of the Holy Ghost. Holy Ghost! O glorious, blessed and sanctify-'ing bond of union between all the regenerate on earth, and all the ransomed 'before the throne of God and the Lamb. Yes, yes, we will manifest to our 'Paedo-baptist brethren that we are full of the Holy Ghost! this will allure, 'will constrain, all that are spiritual among them, to seek and solicit a name 'and place among us. And as for the many, alas! too, too many among 'them, that are not spiritual members of the church of Christ, we want them 'not: the Lord knows, we have enough dead weight, of that sort; as much as 'we can very well stagger under. Take, sir, and welcome, from both denomi-'nations, all the latter description of material, if you can:—should you get 'it, *there will be no lack of slime and brick* to make yourself a *Babel Tower*, 'equal in height, if not in base, to the mountain Cotopaxi. Take it all, sir, 'you know how to manage such material as that; but do not *meddle with the* '"*lively stones*," until the spirit of our God shall have made you a workman 'therefor. To attempt to do any thing to, or for them, until you are thus pre-'pared, will prove like the officiousness of Bruin, in brushing away flies from 'the human face: you will be more apt to injure than preserve! We shall, 'sir, exercise the spirit of prayer on your behalf; and should God the Holy 'Ghost, of whom you appear to be entirely ignorant, convert your precious 'soul, you will then be welcome, to our arms, to our heart, to our all! We

'shall rejoice over you, more than over ninety and nine persons that need no 'repentance; yea, we will "joy over you with singing!!"

Ye ministers and people of the Baptist denomination, let some such sentiments be expressed by you towards Mr. C. immediately, and towards every one whose religious views are what his are. Never, never can you tamper with such glaring errors without the most pernicious of consequences.—O! by all that is adorable in the God-head! by all that is precious in the blood and righteousness of Christ! by all that is connected with the glory of God the Father, the exaltation of the Son, and the honour of his gospel! by all that is essential to the peace, purity, and welfare of the church of Christ at large, and of your own souls individually; I conjure you, to cast out, any and every one from your connexion, who is an unbeliever in the *adorable Spirit's special influences*, in and upon the soul of every real believer. Yea, though an angel from heaven should gainsay the doctrine, be true to your blessed *comforter;* and tell, e'en an angel, that he lies. Ah! the apprehension trembles in my heart, that many of you have been living, days, and weeks, and months, without the "communion of the Holy Ghost." O! mournful circumstances! O! miserable state! No marvel, then, if you have your doubts and fears about the reality of the subject, as part of the christian's experience. Grieve not the Spirit any more; return to seek his presence, you shall find it. THE LOVE OF GOD SHALL THEREBY, ONCE MORE *be shed abroad in your hearts:* your peace be as the rivers, and your righteousness as the waves of the sea! Satan shall fall, like lightning from heaven, and hell recede from you, detected, exposed and defeated, in its direful master-stroke of machination against your souls!! *Full, then, will be the cup of his joy, who, on earth, will be known to you only by the name of*

A REGULAR BAPTIST.

If you have ever understood him to say, either in his preaching or writings, *that the ordinance of baptism has any tendency to wash away sin*, or to infuse holiness *into the soul of man*, he has said that, which, is at direct variance with the Baptist faith; and if he has said it as a Baptist, it is a foul slander upon them—or, if he has said, under the name of a Baptist, that there is no Holy Ghost to operate especially and essentially upon the souls of sinners in conversion, he has denied the faith of the Baptist church—or, if you have understood him as saying, that the moral law of God is not a rule of conduct for the believer in Christ; that also is contrary to the Baptist faith. If he has said that prayer, after a man has believed, or professed to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ; is not a duty, and a *mark of saving faith*, that also is in opposition to the sentiments of the Baptists. If he has said, that preaching the gospel since the apostles' days is gratuitous, and unauthorised by the Lord Jesus Christ; that is likewise foreign to the faith of the Baptist church. *And if he has advanced such doctrines as the foregoing, while professedly a Baptist, what confidence can be placed in his honesty or veracity?* Could you consider that man your friend, who was reporting things of you, by which you would become disgraced in your own estimation, and that of others? who gave curren-

:y to sentiments as yours, which you had disavowed, by the most solemn profession of contrary opinions before God and man. Then turn off your eyes from beholding "vanity" in Mr. C. or any other person of the same character, and remember, that he who bids him, God-speed, is a partaker of his evil deeds. [a]

He has shown, that he considers baptism as either the whole, or part, of the "being born again," which Christ speaks of." He has made Peter say, that it is salvation. He has said, that it washes away adultery, theft, &c.—and is for the remission of sins; and Mr. Rigdon has said, it makes a man holy as an angel!

In view of this exhibit of the subject, by Mr. C. himself, and who will doubt, but what I had reason to charge him, and his fraternity, with the strong delusion of believing, that baptism is a saving ordinance. And what shall be thought of their bitter invective against me, for intimating that they held these sentiments. Now, the fallacy of the foregoing sentiments is known to every christian, spiritual Baptist; because, he feels that dipping had nothing to do in saving him from the guilt of sin—it was the blood of Christ. He knows, that dipping had nothing to do with saving him from the dominion of sin—it was, and is, the Holy Ghost! Every Paido-baptist, of a truly spiritual character, feels the same Holy Ghost—sees the same Invisible Saviour, in all his transcendent fullness of grace and truth; and is as mighty in his emotions of panting desire after the God of his salvation, as is any *Baptist;* and herein, Baptist, and Paido-baptist, have evidence, that God is no respecter of the persons of those whom he has really quickened in righteousness; and, consequently, that all ideas of baptism being essential in the economy of salvation, is in direct opposition to sober facts, and every day experience, with both Baptist and Paido-baptist believers. Every observing man of the world knows, and feels satisfied, that there is *nothing effectual, or of saving* influence, in baptism; inasmuch, as in too many instances, he sees those who have been sprinkled with *a little water*, living in sin! and those who have had water *poured* upon them in baptism, (as it is called) living in more sin than he that was sprinkled! and he also sees, those that have been dipped in four foot water, committing *more sin*, than either of the other professors![c] Such is the fact in many instances; and those, perhaps, who have been baptized in all the modes practised, (that is, those who have been sprinkled, poured upon, and dipped backwards and dipped forwards) are among those who are the least holy as professors—*a striking instance to the point might be referred to in Pittsburgh.*

I will take upon me to assert, that neither Methodist. Presbyterian, Episcopalian, or Baptist, or any other denomination of christians who are of any

(a) A word to the unconverted, in the 27th page of his Letters.

[b] How tallys this interpretation of the *new birth*, with what he has said elsewhere, of *regeneration* being the Pentecostal *out pouring* of the spirit!! but note! Mr. Campbell's contradictions are too numerous for me to think of noticing here!!

[c] I am not to be understood as intimating, that the Baptist *denomination* are less pious than other sects; no, but the reverse is my candid opinion.

general estimation in the world, could, with the shadow of *consistency*, or upon the *fundamental principles of their personal religion*, regard Mr. C. in any other light, than as one of the dry bones in Ezekiel's valley; or, in other words, as a poor deluded unbeliever. For my own part, I must confess, that it is one of the most inexplicable of circumstances that I have ever met with, how he should ever be acknowledged as a believer, in any part of the christian church, after the public expression of the sentiments here quoted from his writings: but above all, how the Baptist denomination should tolerate him for an hour, as one of their ministers! The substance of his views is—That man, *by nature*, has the faculty of faith—that reading the scriptures, attentively, *naturally* produces faith from the testimony of prophecies and miracles—that believing in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, upon that testimony, is faith—that faith is *non-essential* until connected with baptism—that thus believing, and being baptized, and practicing the morality and virtue of the great prophet, makes a christian to all intents and purposes! Now, the *reveries* of Swedenbourg, or the *rationale* of Joseph Priestly, is not more distinct from saving faith, than these views of Mr. C.—Speak, ye mourners in Zion! Ye, who are broken in heart, contrite in spirit, ye heavy ladened and labouring sinners: speak, and tell Mr. Campbell, that e'er saving faith in the Lord Jesus Christ is realized, you find, that *repentance* toward God is essentially necessary—a subject that he speaks not of, writes not of, and *knows nothing about.*

In page 27 of Mr. Greatrake's "Miniature Portrait of Alexander Campbell," he copies from Mr. Campbell's writings, the following extract, viz.

"The grandeur, sublimity and beauty of the foundation of hope, and of ecclesiastical or social union, established by the author and founder of christianity, consisted in this, that THE BELIEF OF ONE FACT, *and that upon the best evidence in the world, is all that is requisite, as far as faith goes, to salvation. The belief of this one fact, and subjection to one institution expressive of it*, is all that is required of heaven, to admission into the church. A christian as defined, not by Dr. Johnson, nor by any creed-maker, but by one taught of heaven, and in heaven, is, one that believes this *one fact*, and has submitted to *one institution*, and whose deportment accords with the morality and virtue taught bythe great prophet. The one fact is, that *Jesus the Nazarene* is the Messiah. The evidence upon which it is to be believed, is the testimony of *twelve men*, confirmed by prophecy, miracles, and spiritual gifts. The one institution is baptism, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Every such person is a christian, in the fullest sense of the word, the moment he has believed this one fact, upon the above evidence, and has submitted to the above mentioned institution."

On this extract Mr. Greatrake remarks as follows, viz:

"Upon this principle, it appears quite evident, that the Devils want nothing but baptizing to be bone fide christians! They said, "we know thee, who thou art, thou Holy One of God." They said, "Paul we know, and Christ we know." They believed this ONE FACT. They NOW believe this one fact

If Mr. Campbell can only get some water to them, or get them to some water, he may have disciples plenty. *Query*—Were not the Devils that entered into the herd of swine, believers of this ONE FACT! they owned Christ to be the "Son of God!" were they not "dipped," (and in the body too) they ran down into the sea—ergo, they were Christians!! Yes, Mr. C. they were just such believers, and christians, as your system makes yourself and your disciples."

No. 17.

The Religious Character of the Parties.

From W. L. M'CALLA to the Rev. Dr. R. H. BISHOP, Principal of MIAMI UNIVERSITY.

While memory lasts, my dear Father, you must be often in my thoughts. I have reason to bless that Providence, who sent you immediately after your arrival in America, to my native woods. Your being among strangers soon gave you an interest in my youthful heart. I admired the ability and dignity with which you filled the chair of Logic and Moral Philosophy in the Transylvania University, and I loved your wisdom, piety and diligence as a Christian and a Minister. Your labours in the University for about twenty years, have laid the institution, the town, the state, and the Western Country, under a weight of obligation which they never can cancel. Notwithstanding this, in the retrograde movements of my unhappy country, they seem to have treated you as the Gadarenes did your master. They wished him to leave them, because they loved their swine better than their Maker. If wallowing in the mire of infidelity and vice will make swine, the Gadara which you have left, is well stocked under Dr. Holley's administration. How mournful that our precious young men should be taught immorality and nonsense, under the name of Moral Science! The funds of the institution are burthened and ruined, to support in extravagance, a frequenter of the race-ground, of the ball-room and of the theatre, and a gallant of theatrical actresses, that he may set a literary class to laughing at religion and religious people, by entertaining them with foolish and profane anecdotes and horrible blasphemies, under the name of scientific lectures! After the pitiable ignorance, vile corruption, and base ingratitude exhibited in the treatment which you received there, what honor does it reflect upon the Legislature of Ohio, to place you at the head of a state institution! Under a man of the religious and literary qualifications which I know you to possess, I do not wonder to hear that it prospers. As to the honorable notice which has been taken of you by most respectable literary institutions in Scotland and America, it is hoped that it does not please yourself, so much as it gratifies your patrons and annoys your enemies.

In the midst of your triumphant honors and arduous duties, it has perhaps never come to your knowledge, that Mr. Campbell, the advocate of Dr. Holley, has assailed your character, by publishing an anecdote concerning the man whose name and office are coincident. As it is, however, to my own knowledge, a fiction, like many other things from the same quarter, I shall not trouble you with it: but in its room permit me to say a word concerning his attack upon my character. In page 373, of his book, he professes to answer certain remarks of mine concerning his departed father Robinson, his living brother Holley, and other such gentry, of "true merit," "the brightest worth," and "the fairest name;" to use his own words. Being much at a loss for the means of defending such *fair*, *bright*, and *meritorious* characters, he consoled himself with the reflection that my statements, deserved no credit, because he had heard that I was convicted of slander by a judicial decision in a civil court. His words are as follows, viz: "It afforded us some consolation his testimony, as "to things of this nature, was harmless, inasmuch as it was re- "ported, that he had lately been convicted by the laws of his "own state, and by a jury of his own country, of having libell- "ed a neighbouring preacher." To this remark he appends a note, in the following words, viz: "The Synod of Kentucky still "hold Mr. M. in good standing, and therefore he came within "the purlieu of my general invitation. Had I known, however, "that such had been the fact, I should have preferred another "disputant."

Here Mr. Campbell insinuates that he had not heard this report before the debate. To those who are acquainted with the circumstances in which he was placed, there is not the least room to hope that this is true. He also confesses that his Antagonist "came within the purlieu of my [Mr. Campbell's] general invitation." This is saying in plain terms that he is the challenger and I the person challenged; the very opposite of which he tries to prove in the same book. The above quotation moreover contains an insinuation against the Synod of Kentucky, a meeting of which, you and I both attended, as members, a few days before the debate. Now it so happened, that a deluded clerical neighbour of mine, whose name I am now unwilling to record in connexion with so disgraceful a transaction, brought up, by appeal, to this very Synod, every accusation which he thought could have the least tendency to crush me: and although he was well acquainted with this civil transaction, he did not charge me with any error in relation to Mr. Gardner, the preacher referred to by Mr. Campbell, as having been slandered by me. The reason was that he knew the contempt which such a step would bring upon him, in a place where the affair was so well known. But when, from a unanimous decision of the Synod, in my favour, he appealed to the General Assembly, he put into the hands of Dr. Ely, his Counsel, many new and dreadful reproaches, with dis-

cretionary power to use them or not to use them. The two which he divulged, both related to Mr. Gardner. One of them was, calling him a son of the Devil, and the other stated that he had recovered damages from me in a case of slander. As for the remainder of the Budget, the learned counsel seemed to insinuate that they were of so serious a nature that the developement might possibly give an irremediable shock to the nerves of the House. They were therefore kept back, whether for private use or not, I did not enquire; for I have a Saviour, who in his own time and way, will deliver me from those slanders which look me in the face, and from those which skulk behind my back. He did defend me in the General Assembly, blessed be his name, and may he ever preserve me from the circumstances in which the investigation of that day placed my Accuser and his Counsel. You know, my dear Father, that I have been a grievous sinner; but I believe that you know also, that since I loved the Lord Jesus more than life, I hate sin worse than death.

Mr. Mathew Gardner, the preacher concerned in the above charges, is in the connexion and under the direction of Mr. Barton W. Stone, who is the disciple of Mr. Craighead, Dr. Fishback's spiritual father. You are well aware that Mr. Stone is the Apostle of a sect of Anti-Trinitarians, who as they use immersion in baptism, and reject infants from that ordinance, are known as Unitarian Baptists. Mr. Gardner, of course, is a brother of Mr. Campbell, and must, like Dr. Holley, be esteemed by him, a man of "true merit," "the brightest worth," and "the fairest name." He preached statedly in my nameless Accuser's neighbourhood, and robbed him of some of his communicants, without receiving any direct opposition. One of his members who with several others, was on the point of following his apostate brethren, owned the ground on which Mr. Gardner held many of his crowded meetings. This member requested me to preach in the same place. Just then a Deacon of Mr. Gardner's stepped in, and requested that, as the weather was getting cool, I would preach in a school-house occupied by Mr. Gardner in the winter. My nameless friend had never come thither, to oppose what he believed to be fatal error; but soon after I preached, he came and preached, in the same place, for the first time, and denounced me to the assembly. His reason was, that I had been ordained in Kentucky, my native state, without the leave of him and his Presbytery in Ohio, who professed to have some claims upon me. These claims were fairly and fully tried, and forever invalidated by the General assembly of 1821, which condemned the manner in which a pretended right had been exercised. They accordingly pronounced my ordination valid. Notwithstanding this, he accused me before the Presbytery, of the enormous crime of preaching on his side of the river, near two miles from the spot on which I resided! It was from their decision that he appealed to the upper court, of which you were

then a member. The Synod could recollect that near the beginning of this century, Mr. Stone and his companions were deposed and excommunicated from our Church, and that, by an act of their own body, these men are, to this day, considered as schismatic intruders and heretics. They could see that Mr. Gardner's irregularity was real, while mine was only asserted. They could see that I agreed with my Accuser, who was an Orthodox, Presbyterian preacher, while Mr. Gardner was an infidel in disguise. They had evidence that Mr. Gardner had robbed him of several members, and that I was instrumental in preventing him from entrapping several more, and that I had never taken any of his members, until he determined to cast them out for encouraging me to preach; and there was evidence of record before the Synod, that he and his Session had cast out fourteen members, for this reason. They could not help, therefore, wondering at his zeal against me, and his passive deportment towards Mr. Gardner. The more I saw myself out of the reach of my Accuser's arm, the more was I distressed at his unreasonable persecution. Being delivered from personal resentment, my heart felt more pungently for the wounded cause of religion. You well recollect that when the Synod heard the papers and then the plea of my accuser, I submitted the case, without a word of defence. Notwithstanding the solicitations of several, I persisted in my silence, and should have continued so to do, had not Mr. Cameron said, with a degree of passion, that, if the party had nothing to urge in his defence, he would move that the appeal be sustained. I well recollect the horror with which the synod shuddered at the manner in which the accused and his session, and the accuser's fourteen outcast children had been treated: and that for no other reason, than that I preached the same doctrines which he professed, in a place where he never preached, and to a people who were very hungry, very needy, and in very great danger of destruction. I well recollect the Scottish plainness, with which, when called on to speak, you directed your awful eye, and your significant finger toward the accuser, and said, that his conduct was like that which filled up the cup of iniquity of the Jewish nation, who persecuted the Apostles, because they preached the Gospel to the Gentiles. This persecution aided other providential difficulties to separate me from a congregation between which and myself there was a tender attachment. Immediately after that event, which was truly mournful to more than one of the parties, I came to this place to meet the appeal to the General Assembly, who rejected it, notwithstanding the zeal of the the able advocate, who, in the fervor of his eloquence, was pleased to call me *a wandering star* and many such pleasant things. These events were under a merciful Providence, the occasion of my settling in my present situation, where I enjoy more happiness, than I expected to see in this world, after parting with my dearly beloved little flock in Augusta. As I was in good standing with the Synod of Kentucky, where my accuser dared not charge me with slan-

dering Mr. Gardner, so am I now, in good standing with the Synod of Philadelphia, and that with the cheerful acquiescence of my Accuser's advocate. And if Mr. Campbell or any one else, will attend their next meeting, or the next one to that, or the one following that, (if I should live so long,) and prove to them that I have slandered Mr. Gardner, I promise to waive the article of limitations or any other which might stand in the way of a prosecution.

Soon after the commencement of my preaching on the forbidden ground, Mr. Gardner attended for the purpose of conversing with me after service. As he had, after the Unitarian fashion, deceived many well-meaning people, by a wily concealment of his real character, and standing, and sentiments, I was rejoiced at this opportunity of a public interview. A few friendly questions soon unmasked him to the view of the by-standers: after which I told him, in the same dispassionate manner, the irreconcilable difference which there was, between his religion and that of the bible. Although he and Mr. Stone were in the habit of pronouncing the very worst condemnations upon Trinitarians, they nevertheless entice many by a feigned charity and good *brotherhood.* These arts he tried with me. He soon found that I could not accept the confraternity of a man who would deny my Lord, trample upon his atoning blood, reject his spirit, "and by Good "words, and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." "Well," said he, "Mr. M'Calla, as you will not allow me to call you Brother M'Calla"—— —'Mr. Gardner,' said I, 'if I 'do not own you as a brother, it is for the same reason that made 'Polycarp act thus towards Marcion, when that conspicuous 'teacher entreated him to own him. *I do own thee*, says Poly-'carp, *as the first born of the Devil.*' This is the real expression which occasioned my Accuser's charge against me in the General Assembly. Now he and I are perfectly agreed about Mr. Gardner's real character. He believes him as truly a child of the Devil as Marcion, or Cerinthus, or Elymas. Would not consistency, then, require him to condemn Polycarp, and Polycarp's Pastor the Apostle John, and his fellow labourer, the Apostle Paul? There are very many who are willing to garnish the tombs of the Prophets, but they will traduce those living men, who love a crucified Saviour better than their own character or comfort.

After the above conversation, I continued to preach in the same house with Mr. Gardner, because it was built and furnished by the patrons of both parties. But a Deacon of his at last secured the key and shut us out, because he owned the ground. The weather then permitted us to occupy a tent in a grove, only a few steps from the school-house, where one of my friends had permitted Mr. Gardner to hold his meetings, As Mr. Campbell's brother Gardner and his people were better at wielding the arm of flesh than the sword of the Spirit, about twenty of his disciples came in a body, and tore down the *stand*, or boarded tent, (in

which we worshipped,) while Mr. Clark, the owner of the land was remonstrating against the outrage. Previous to the sabbath another tent was built, farther off: but on Saturday night, that also was demolished. The next day I mounted a chair, and preached to an attentive audience. While adverting for a few moments to the conduct of our adversaries, I observed that the face of a gigantic hearer, (Mr. A. L.) reddened far too rapidly. I therefore had to turn the subject into an exhortation to patience and prudence, forbearance and forgiveness, lest the congregation should seek redress in a summary way, by tearing down the school-house. If they had done so, without my opposing or condemning such a measure, before or after it was taken, Mr. Campbell would justly have considered me more deeply guilty than any of them. Just so he should think of his brother Gardner. He neither opposed the measure of pulling down the tent, at first, nor made it a subject of investigation or censure afterward. He is therefore more deeply guilty of this trespass than any of his ignorant and deluded followers. The instruments by which he perpetrated this crime were amerced in damages to the amount of 124 dollars, in an action of trespass, by the verdict of a jury of his own country: yet his brother Campbell takes no notice of this; but considers him and all Baptists free from all such charges of lawless violence, and stigmatizes us with almost all the persecution and tyranny known on earth.

If Mr. Gardner had been consulted beforehand, it is probable that he would have had sense enough to beg Mr. Campbell not to bring him and his damages into the public view; because his character is by no means better for examination. Like his Unitarian brother, he is much opposed to receiving a salary for preaching, but like him he has other ways of making money which are not remarkably honorable. I shall not dwell upon his contrivances to obtain contributions in money and clothes, nor the disgraceful traffick in which he was detected and disappointed at Ripley. I shall confine myself to the subject which occasioned the judicial decision referred to by Mr. Campbell But, no. So inconsistant, disgusting and disgraceful was the occupation of Mr. Campbell's Clerical brother, that I am forbidden by my friend Mr. E. to stain my pages with it Suffice it to say, that it was a business to which he very naturally added that of a horse-jocky.

In the prosecution of these professions, the Bishop unhappily contracted a habit for which his brother Campbell is remarkable. This habit adhered to him in all his intercourse in society, even where horses had nothing to do, and occasioned many unfavourable reports concerning him, some of which found their way into the press. A handbill was published by Mr. Thompson, a respectable Methodist preacher, proving by the testimony of near fifty witnesses, that he was guilty of telling a palpable falsehood. In a horse trade which he had with the husband of one of his own followers, he shewed almost as great an aversion to giving his people money for their horses, as to receiving a salary for his

preaching. The injured man prosecuted Mr. Gardner for fraud and falsehood, before the congregation. They met, refused to receive Mr. Hughes's written charges, refused to hear his witnesses, let Mr. Gardner tell his own story, let him take the chair and put the thing to vote, and as there was no negative, he pronounced the cause decided in his favour, and there it ended. Mr. Hughes then exposed him in an anonymous pamphlet, purporting to be a letter from one of Mr. Gardner's people, to his Master, Barton W. Stone. After a ludicrous account of Mr. Gardner's trial, it speaks as follows, viz: "There are only two "things that can be lamented in the whole transaction. One is "that brother Gardner imprudently denied the promise given to "Mr. Hughes, when there was evidence at hand to prove the "promise. Another is, that he declared that to be the first "time that his veracity had been impeached, when all the people "knew that Mr. Thompson had proved him a liar by scores of "witnesses. These things are to be regretted, not in a moral "point of view, for to a liberal mind, this is a mere *trifle*, (to use "a favourite word of yours;) but because of the effect they are "likely to produce on a people not yet sufficiently confirmed in "our system of religion" The pamphlet then proceeds to enumerate several things in which the above trial of Mr. Gardner is calculated to promote the cause of religion and civilization. The third particular is as follows, viz: "By this step the last "objection of infidelity to our religion is removed. We "first stripped the bible of the peculiar dogmas of the Genevan "School. We then removed the mysteries of the Trinity and "atonement, &c. But with regard to most Deists, said old "Father Rice, 'the greatest of all objections, *the morals*, *the* "*morals* of the bible still remain' Now I will leave it to you, "if brother Gardner's trial does not remove this objection. He "was publicly proved a liar by Mr. Thompson, and he denied "before the church that he had ever been accused;——he made "a promise of cencessions to Mr. Hughes, and denied that "promise, when there was written testimony in the house to "prove it;——and he bought a horse, or, (which is nearly the "same thing,) he bought a mare, and after trying to sell her as "his own property, he publicly and perseveringly denies the "contract, in a large congregation, where many of his own peo-"ple and others also can attest the fact. If any Deist, after this, "can think us righteous overmuch, and be frightened from join-"ing us, by the rigidity of our morals, he must have a *tender con-*"*science* indeed."

It was Mr. Hughes's design to give point to the above pamphlet by making it actionable. For that reason it declared that Mr. Gardner "was publicly proved a liar by Mr. Thompson," and "that Mr. Thompson had proved him a liar by scores of witnesses." These were at last made the ground of a prosecution, not against Mr. Hughes, but against myself, who readily confessed both out of court and in it, that I had written the pamphlet at Mr. Hughes's request. I therefore plead justification, or rath-

er this was done in my name, by those gentlemen of the bar who generously volunteered their services in my defence. For this purpose Mr. John Chambers, of Mason county Kentucky, went to Brown county, Ohio, out of his own State, and out of his own circuit, for the sake of doing a noble action, for the very expenses of which he refused to receive any remuneration. It was chiefly for the sake of Mr. Gardner's money that his lawyers urged the prosecution. Besides, the wife of one of them was a sister Baptist, and had in common with her husband, a very strong personal hatred against me; and his other lawyer, an infidel brother, was very near going to *the seat of government*, by the election of twelve jurymen. but escaped by the wickedness of the States-Attorney, who was a relative. The jury hung, and Mr Gardner withdrew the prosecution at his own expense, and not a little did it cost him. Urged by the avarice and disappointed malice of his attorneys, he afterward brought suit in my own state, and in the town where I lived. At that time the Baptist with whom Mr. Campbell afterward lodged in Washington, resided in Augusta, and was a violent enemy of mine. I found, when it was too late, that one of the jurymen whom I had neglected to challenge, was a bosom friend and kindred spirit of his. Another such man was received in the same way, through my ignorance, while a friend of mine was eagerly but vainly endeavouring to give me information of my danger. A case occurred, which shewed me that such information was far more important than an inexperienced person would suppose. Before the trial, an adherent of the Plaintiff harangued a little knot of hearers, with some vehemence, against me, and in Mr. Gardner's favour. A friend of mine who providentially heard him, informed me of the fact, and appeared particularly anxious to impress it upon my memory, because the expressions of this envenomed declaimer involved a sort of threat that he meant to throw himself into the way, that he might become a juryman. The result proved that my informant was not mistaken. In due time this worthy advocate of Mr. Campbell's Unitarian brother, was called, and with the livid hue of deliberate perjury on his lips, declared, under the solemnity of an oath, that he had never formed nor expressed an opinion upon the case then before the Court. He was of course laid aside by peremptory challenge: but the mischief was already done by the reception of one or two others whom it was too late to remove. It was in vain for these to persuade the rest of the jurymen that the expressions of the anonymous pamphlet were not strictly true. Many living witnesses had attested in court, that Mr. Gardner was guilty of the very falsehood which Mr. Thompson had made public. Mr. Thompson's handbill was before them with the attestation of near fifty names. It was therefore too plain that Mr. Gardner "was publicly proved a liar by Mr. Thompson" and "that Mr. Thompson had proved him a liar by scores of witnesses." Mr. Gardner's friends in the jury were consequently obliged to take new ground against me, which I was equally well prepared to meet, but to which I had never had an opportunity of replying, as it had never

appeared before the Court. While in the jury-room, they persuaded their companions to believe that if I was not guilty of defamation, I was at least guilty of intrusion, in crossing the river to preach on the Ohio side, which was already pre-occupied by Mr. Gardner; and in interfering with the quarrel between him and Mr. Thompson: so that although their favourite might be guilty of lying, I was in their view, guilty of meddling. This is the substance of what I was informed one of the jurymen afterward related in Mr. James Armstrong's store. If this crime had been actionable, and I had been openly and honourably accused of it, I should have replied that my preaching on the Ohio side was in compliance with the earnest solicitations, and the urgent necessities of the people; that the place was less than two miles from my own residence; that during the greater part of the time it was on the farms of members of my own church; and that, under my ministry, it pleased God to bring a number of persons to give good evidence of a change of heart. If therefore they had put me in jail for this alledged intrusion, as the Philippians did the Apostle Paul, for preaching in a place preoccupied by heathenism, it would have been my privilege to praise God in my bonds. As for exposing the doctrinal and moral character of an errorist who preaches in sight of me, if this be meddling, then it is a duty, as the Apostle John testifies to the Ephesian Church, when he says, "thou hast tried them which say they are Apostles, and are not; and hast found them liars." But Mr. Gardner's advocates persuaded the jury to think otherwise. And to this they were impelled by an anxiety to be relieved from their confinement, and by a degree of compassion artfully excited in behalf of Mr. Gardner, who had already lost the price of several horses in lawyer's fees and other expenses. This they seemed to think might be a sufficient punishment for his real crime; and for my supposed offence of meddling, they thought it not too severe to make me in this last prosecution, pay the *costs*, which, (according to the technical use of that word,) amounted to less than seventeen Dollars, much less than what it cost Mr. Gardner. In order to throw the costs upon an innocent man, for a crime of which he was not even accused, they were obliged to give the Plaintiff a verdict; and in order to its being a verdict at all, it must award specific damages. They therefore fixed the damages at ONE CENT. Yes, ONE CENT DAMAGES were given to Mr. Campbell's worthy brother, to heal the wound made in his character, by a pamphlet which said "that Mr. Thompson had proved him a liar by scores of witnesses."

Now remember, this is the verdict by which Mr. Campbell says that his Antagonist "had lately been convicted by the laws of his own state, and by a jury of his own country, of having libelled a neighbouring preacher." This is the verdict which he quotes, as proving me unworthy of credit, and of course unworthy of "good standing" in the Synod of Kentucky. If there be any meaning in these declarations of his, it is the following. 1. That my charging Mr. Gardner with lying was a false accusa-

tion, and of course, constituted me guilty of that crime. This is evident from his pretending that on this account, my "testimony" was "harmless." 2. His insinuation against the Synod for continuing me in good standing shews that he would be understood that for the alledged libellous matter of my pamphlet, I deserved deposition and excommunication. 3. He evidently designs to make the public believe that the jury agreed with him, in treating the pamphlet as a defamatory libel, and that they shewed their agreement by a verdict of suitable damages for the Plaintiff. All these particulars he makes to hang upon one pivot, the verdict of the jury. This he thinks decisive proof that they thought me a guilty defamer of an innocent man, and their thinking so, he gives as the reason why he and the Synod and the public should treat me as a libeller of good men. Now if it can be shewn that the jury did not think so, and that Mr. Campbell knew it, and that he designedly concealed this truth, and tried to give currency to an opinion which he knew to be untrue, it will not require a civil prosecution and a verdict of *one cent*, to make his book and its author appear in an unfavourable light. Here I will not stop to question Mr. Campbell's faith in the infallibility of a jury, but Popish as his doctrine is on this subject, I will suppose that he is correct in taking it for granted that whatever they thought concerning my guilt was right. I ask what evidence have we that they thought my pamphlet a false and defamatory libel against Mr. Gardner? If they really thought so, can we suppose that they would omit to award him sufficient damages to indemnify him for his pecuniary disbursements in the tedious prosecution on both sides of the river? If two or three hundred Dollars would cover this expense, would that be an extravagant allowance? But besides his loss of money and labour, of time and comfort, was the character of a worthy, persecuted innocent man, worth nothing? Solomon says, "A good name is better than precious ointment." "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches." Suppose that I had robbed Mr. Gardner of that ointment which he sold at Ripley, or of those riches which he made by keeping and trading horses, would the jury have required me to restore only a cent? But we will suppose that they were so mistaken, as to think a man's character worth no more than the old board tent which Mr. Gardner's followers destroyed for Mr. Clark. This the jury estimated at one hundred and twenty-four Dollars. Can any one believe that twelve citizens of Kentucky would esteem a few weather-beaten boards to be worth twelve thousand four hundred times as much as the character of an innocent persecuted man? If he was really a man of truth, I must have been extremely culpable in publishing that he had been proved a liar: and my guilt was peculiarly aggravated, for every body who saw Mr. Thompson's handbill, with its scores of witnesses, believed the truth of my statement. The most respectable members and officers of his own synagogue believed it. His own lawyers believed it. One of them at first volunteered with five other advocates, to defend my cause, and when the Court refused to permit more than four to speak on each side, he

received a fee from Mr. Gardner. With my publication in one hand and Mr, Thompson's in the other, I defy any man of common sense and ordinary respectability to deny it. Mr. Campbell himself, with all his fondness for prevarication, has not denied it, and he probably never will. But he has done what is equally inconsistent with veracity and honesty, he has endeavoured to injure me by quoting an adverse verdict, and concealing its most important feature, the ONE CENT DAMAGES, the mention of which he knew would give a new face to the subject, and make him appear a contemptible slanderer. In what other light would the community view me, if I were to assail Dr. Fishback's character for veracity upon the ground which Mr. Campbell has assumed against me? and yet I myself was present in the Nicholasville Court, when, "By the laws of his own state, and by a jury of his own country," Dr. Fishback was amerced in ONE CENT DAMAGES, in an action of slander, brought by Dr. J. R. And the jury gave the same reason for it, that is, that Dr. Fishback ought at least, to pay the costs. Yet Mr. Campbell quoted Dr. Fishback as a respectable author, on those subjects on which he pretended that my credibility was destroyed by this *one cent* verdict. But circumstances alter cases. I am a Pedobaptist, and of course full of moral *deformity*; and Dr. Fishback is a Pelagian Baptist, just now sent by Mr. Campbell to *reform* the Boston Unitarians. When a Pedobaptist of Virginia, procured a judicial decision, for fining and imprisoning my old friend Mr. Lewis Craig, Mr. Campbell quotes it in both his debates, as a proof of the persecuting tendency of Pedobaptism. To this he will probably add the decision in Ohio, against those who pulled down our tent. But when his brother Gardner, a Unitarian Baptist, procures a verdict of one cent against me, for telling the truth, and for preaching the Gospel on his side of the river, this is no longer persecution, but it is good reason why my own Synod should depose and excommunicate me!

You will pardon me, my dear Preceptor, for taxing your patience so largely on this subject, I have done this, because silence on my part would give his libel the semblance of truth, and would be esteemed an indirect acknowledgment of guilt. I have done this the more readily, because, as far as my recollection serves, this is the only charge against my moral character, which he professes to support by any tangible evidence. Well would it be for him, if only one, and that an unsupported charge of falsehood could be brought against him. But in Nos. 13, 14, and 15, of these collateral papers, you will find many such faults stated according to truth and evidence. Yet let me assure you that they are very far from being a full list of the misstatements contained in his book. Open the volume almost any where, and you will see errors of this sort on both pages. The very paragraph in which he charges me with libelling a neighboring preacher, is headed with an instance which has not been mentioned in any of the preceding papers. He there says, "Seventh day, met according to adjournment." Now it is a notorious fact, that

on the seventh day, the people and two of the Moderators and myself had to wait a full hour after the time to which we had adjourned, before Mr. Campbell and his Moderator made their appearance. As our President was to leave us that evening, and as there was much important matter which I had not yet touched, and which I should be compelled to abridge at any rate, I thought that Mr. Campbell took a very ungenerous advantage in this delay: and many of the people thought this an additional evidence that he was heartily *sick* of the debate, although his general health might be improving. If I recollect rightly, Mr. Lowry made such an observation himself: and accordingly when we commenced business, he sat down and wrote the following notice of the affair, as it is now before me in his own Abstract. Viz: "Wednesday morning. 7th day of the debate. *Campbell "came an hour too late.*" This may serve to shew the comparative merit of Mr. Campbell's notes and those of Mr. Lowry. Mr. Lowry endeavoured to state things as they really passed: Mr. Campbell stated, or misstated, or concealed, as it appeared most likely to serve his interest. It is for this reason that Mr. Lowry has declared in his certificate copied in the Preface to this work, that he "can unhesitatingly say, that the account given is essentially incorrect as to the matter and manner" This habitual disregard of the truth is one feature in which he strongly resembles his spiritual father, Robinson, and his spiritual grandfather, who, as our Saviour informs us, was a teller of falsehoods from the beginning. That he is their disciple, Mr. Greatrake has fully proved, as in No. 16, above.

He is their disciple in opposing the Christian ministry. On this subject Robinson speaks as follows, viz: "After the defeat of that numerous, learned, and wealthy church, called "Catholick, farther attempts to prove what they have contended for, are extremely rash and entirely hopeless, and go on a "principle wholly disallowed in pure Christianity, the necessity "of a standing priesthood. The Apostle Paul gave a rule to the "Corinthians, applicable to baptizing as well as to preaching. "*Ye may all prophecy one by one, that all may learn and all may "be comforted.* And the right of every Christian to enlarge the "kingdom of Christ by teaching and baptizing others, is perfectly in unison with the whole spirit and temper of Christianity. "The conduct of Jesus was uniform. He first called twelve, "afterwards seventy, and when he extended his commission to "the whole world, he appointed above five hundred, and in them "all Christians to the end of the world; nor is it imaginable "that he uttered any prohibition against such as should increase "his holy empire by instruction and baptism:"[a] Here the abolition of a regular ministry is made to rest on Christ's ordination of all Christians to that office, and his ordination of all Christians is made to rest on Mr. Robinson's unscriptural imagination: for although Christ, by his Spirit, has uttered many prohibitions

[a] Robinson's History of Baptism, American Edition, p. 54.

nation of five hundred men and of all Christians in them, is a mere fiction of his own imagination. There is no more proof that Christ conferred ministerial ordination on the five hundred witnesses of his ascension, and on all Christians in them, than that our last General Assembly ordained all who witnessed their deliberations, all the men, women, and children, and all their posterity to the end of the world. Yet baseless and *base* as this anti-clerical system is, Mr. Campbell is Mr. Robinson's humble follower. I do not say that he acts consistently with his profession; for while he makes war upon the ministerial order in general, he is instituting a new clerical college of his own, and he is very willing to spare all of the old order who will come over to his side. He denies that any Christian can be a bishop, while he is a Pedobaptist. Yet he calls Sydney Rigdon a bishop, because he belongs to Mr. Campbell's new corps of Baptist Bishops. Among the old school, Mr. Greatrake is no bishop, for a well known reason: but Mr. Verdeman is a *great* bishop, for a reason as well known. Even little Mr. Vaughn is called a bishop, because he falls into the ranks: but although Mr. Campbell spoke and wrote very pathetically about Mr. Lewis Craig, he did not call him a bishop, because he was unable to learn the new tactics. After the old gentleman had been imprisoned for Christ's sake, more than half a century ago, he did not feel willing to sell his master now for an empty name.

Mr. Campbell is also a disciple of Robinson in that liberality which is indifferent to truth and holiness, and which stigmatizes as inquisitors all who exercise ecclesiastical discipline, especially when they are aided in that important scriptural duty by the use of a public creed. On this subject Mr. Robinson speaks as follows, viz: "The Baptist churches were constituted on grounds "just and liberal, and at an infinite distance from the foremen- "tioned principle of the inquisition. The creeds which they "published, therefore, are not to be considered as a publick "faith, which it would be accounted heresy to contradict; but "the scripture, and the scripture interpreted by individuals, "was the true and real foundation of their first churches. It "must be allowed, however, that they have not all acted on this "principle. Most are divided into two principal branches, on "the speculative points of grace and free will; the particular "Baptists holding Arminianism as an heresy, and the General "Baptists considering Calvinism in the same light, and neither "admitting the other to church communion, and both consider- "ing the Socinian Baptists as inadmissible to their churches. "All allow separate societies to judge for themselves; many al- "low individuals in their churches to differ, except on funda- "mental articles; and some have no fundamental articles, and "only require a person to profess himself a believer in Christ; "and this seems to be the only true ground of action."[b] In

[b] History of Baptism, p. 504.

this passgea Mr. Robinson opposes creeds as illiberal, and inquisitorial, because they are apt to contain fundamental articles of faith. This he thinks wrong, because it so often excludes Socinians from the church. In the preceding page he tells us that, at the Reformation, Dudith joined the Baptists, "for the "sake of a liberty of saying what he would on every subject." He tells us that "he quitted the Lutheran and Calvinistic "churches, and for this he settled in that of the Unitarians in "Poland, where in the enjoyment of this precious liberty, he "felt a happiness which he had never known before." In the following page he celebrates the praises of another Unitarian Baptist of the same period, who was condemned for dissenting from a creed which recognizes the Son as co-essential with the Father. This was the identical reason for which the Council of Nice condemned Arius. As Mr. Duncan censures the latter, so does Mr. Robinson the former, and for the same reason. Mr. Campbell has as great an opposition as either of them, to creeds with fundamental articles, tending to shut out Unitarians. It is a little amusing to read the note which Mr. Benedict, the American Editor of Robinson, has appended to his remark about "no fundamental articles." He says "It may be question-"ed whether there is not a little too much laxity in this ex-"pression." I think he might as well have *questioned* whether there was not *a little* too much laxity in the bowels of Judas and Arius, when they gushed out, and the guilty wretches expired.

That Mr. Campbell is Mr. Robinson's humble disciple in his opposition to creeds, and fundamental articles of faith, and the exercise of church discipline, is evident to those who are conversant with his writings. For one passage to this purpose I would refer you to the close of No. 16 above. Besides a contemptuous notice of *creed-makers*, in that passage, he tells us, (as is usual with those who snarl at creeds,) what sort of a creed he would make. He tells us that "the belief of one fact, and that "upon the best evidence in the world, is all that is requisite, as "far as faith goes, to salvation." "The one fact is, that Jesus "the Nazarene is the Messiah." Compare this with the creed given above from Mr. Robinson and his Unitarian Baptists, who "only require a person to profess himself a believer in Christ." "This," says he, "seems to be the only true ground of action:" That is, this is the only profession requisite to baptism, and, of course, to admission into the church. To the same amount Mr. Campbell says, "The belief of this one fact, and subjection to "one institution [baptism] expressive of it, is all that is requir-"ed of heaven to admission into the church." Here then we have their views of doctrine and discipline. For "a person to "profess himself a believer" in "the one fact" "that Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah," and to receive adult baptism by immersion, is all that is necessary to entitle him to every ecclesiastical privilege, even to the right of preaching the gospel and baptizing others. These terms were evidently made to embrace all Unitarian Baptists; for they all profess to believe this one

fact, and they receive adult baptism by immersion. But Mr. Greatrake justly shews that these terms of communion embrace devils too, for they profess to believe this one fact, and those of them who entered the herd of swine, received adult immersion in a lake which is formed by the important river Jordan. These then must be members of Mr. Robinson's and Mr. Campbell's church. To be consistent, they must be considered duly qualified ministers of religion, and be called bishops. Mr. Campbell has frequently tried to make his readers laugh at our Presbyteries, Synods and General Assembly: but really an Ecclesiastical Association of his packing is no laughing matter. We might find Bishop Beelzebub in the chair, with Bishop Chemosh and Bishop Campbell at the table, acting as clerks. On the right hand we might see Bishop Vaughn, Verdeman and Mammon, and on the left, Bishops Gardner and Lucifer, with Bishops Robinson, Rigdon and Dagon; while the main body of this liberal Association might be composed of Simon Magus and his Gnostics, Cerinthus and the Ebionites, the Monophysites of the East and the Unitarians of the West. This is the sort of Company in Which Mr. Robinson's worthy Bishop Dudith "felt a happiness which he had never "known before." Here he had "a liberty of saying what he would [provided it is false] on every subject." Who would not, with him, leave "the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches," for "the enjoyment of this precious liberty?" "Our lips are our "own; who is Lord over us?" From this august church Mr. Campbell excludes all the Pedobaptist, creed-making world; that is, the great body of the Christian world: and, blessed be God, they have no wish for a seat there. May you and I be faithful members of that Church which has publicly refused to acknowledge Unitarian Baptism; and when called hence, may we be at liberty to sing the song of Moses and the Lamb, in the General Assembly of the Church of the First born on high——a song in which no Unitarian ever joined, an Assembly in wich no Unitarian was ever found.

Yours sincerely and affectionately,

W. L. M'CALLA.

Philadelphia, Oct. 19, 1826.

No. 18.

Mr. Campbell's Literary and Polemical Character.

From W. L. M'Calla to the Rev. John T. Edgar, Maysville, Kentucky.

Beloved Brother;——I am now about to redeem a pledge which you probably thought that I had forgotten. You were very well satisfied that I had encountered Mr. Campbell, until your mind was changed a few months afterward, by information

received from his neighbourhood. You then told me that, from unanswerable evidence, his character was too low to justify so formal a notice by any respectable man; and that, in defence of my own character, an apology should be made to the public. This I promised to do. Since that time, your information has been confirmed by many direct communications to myself, from men of the first standing in his part of the world, and by travellers through that country, some of them Baptists and some Pedobaptists. With three or four exceptions, the respectable part of society appear to have adopted the same plan; that is, to let him curse on, and pay no attention to him. Some profess to avoid him, as a well dressed gentleman would avoid an animal in our woods, whose formidable missile is a species of musk not generally relished as a perfume. Others seem to avoid him from a conscientious opposition to controversy. They think it wrong for an ecclesiastic or an ecclesiastical court to take any public notice of a prevailing heresy. Their plan is to pray it down, and to live it down, and to preach it down, not by controversy, but by instruction. This is the plan pursued in Massachusetts, ever since heresy made its appearance there. The consequence is that the prayer of faith, holy living, and instructive preaching are comparatively scarce articles there now. These things, together with Confessions of Faith, have been laid aside, as savouring of the inquisition! It will probably be admitted that the inspired Prophets and Apostles, and it cannot be reasonably denied that our fathers of the seventeenth century, in England and Scotland, were as faithful as any of the present generation, in praying, living, and teaching; yet in the name of their God, they met false prophets and apostles, hereties and heresies, full in the face, and by that very means, promoted wisdom, piety and vigilance in themselves and others. The clergy of this City have fairly tried both experiments. A man of Mr. Campbell's religious character, but, I think, his inferior in education and talents, talked, preached and printed in this place, until he built an elegant church in the Northern Liberties, in addition to a fine one which he already occupied near the Southern confine of the City. These churches were crowded to overflowing, and proselytes multiplied, while the clergy were silent: but after almost every pulpit in the city had resounded for months with the refutation of every prominent feature of his abominable system, he hastily emigrated to a neighbouring city, the clergy of which are trying silently to live down his error, while he is building a new church for the propagation of it.

I do not believe that many intelligent Pedobaptists are sorry that Dr. Wall defended Christian Baptism, either before or after the assault which Mr. Gale made upon him. And notwithstanding the contempt which is thrown upon Mr. Campbell for his low cunning, his mean duplicity, as well as his audacious effrontery, it is more than probable that in these respects, as well as his literary and polemical talents, he very much resembles Mr. Gale. That the latter took great liberties in perverting the sense and

altering the words of his Antagonist is fully shewn by Dr. Wall in his Defence, throughout. One glaring instance may be seen in his ninth Chapter.[a] You will also recognize the resemblance in Dr. Wall's description of Mr. Gale, in the following words, viz: "He writes in a style indeed, sufficiently fluent, and with "a good stock of philological learning, but does not keep very "close to the rules of candour, modesty or truth, but delights in "vaunting, insulting, slighting, and laying odious and false im-"putations." Their resemblance in one polemical trick is very remarkable. Mr. Campbell pronounced almost every one of my arguments a *petitio principii*, or a *begging of the question*. In page 303, he says, "This is a *petitio principii*, a begging of the "question. Let this first be proved. But it cannot" Without troubling you with many instances of this declamatory logic, I will point you to one which embraces every other. In his recapitulation in page 388, he says, "It was also shewn that he "[Mr. M'Calla] begged every question connected with his views "of Baptism." From this you may see that Mr. Campbell's answer to every argument was to pronounce it a *petitio principii*. In this he closely followed Mr. Gale, as will appear from the following words of Dr. Wall, viz: "He tells, them their argument "for infant baptism, from *seminal* holiness, is a *petitio principii;* "by which I should guess," says the Dr., "that they have "said something beyond his reach; for that is the common name "that he gives to all arguments that he cannot answer."

These men are also very much alike in their bold way of denying what their antagonists have said and done. Although Dr. Wall's book is evidence that he used arguments from scripture, Mr. Gale denies it: so although I triumphantly refuted Mr. Campbell's arguments, he denies that I noticed them at all. "Mark it," says he, "my friends, Mr. M'Calla has not replied "to one of them." "Having also advanced sundry arguments "both as respects the subject and action of baptism, which he "has not so much as ventured to impugn" "You will have "the goodness to bear in mind that not one of them has been for-"mally impugned by Mr. M'Calla." "He has not so much "as yet adverted to my disquisition on the words in controver-"sy." "Has he met me on that point either? No, no. In "no one instance, from the commencement of this discussion, "dare he encounter me on any definite terms. He does best at "a great distance. He keeps off at sea, fearing to be land "bound." Similar expressions are found even in his recapitulation, where he says, "These arguments have never been at-"tacked by my Opponent." In this same recapitulation he also says, "I called upon Mr. M'Calla to read from the same "volume, [the New Testament,] his authority for infant bap-"tism, but he could find nothing to read and withdrew to Rob-"inson."[c] Whether it be true that I "could find nothing to

[a] See p. 200 of the 4th London Edition.

[c] See Debate pp. 234, 255, 146, 301, 225, 388, 390.

"read" from the New Testament on this subject, you and thousands of others can attest. In the same spirit of truth, Mr. Gale says repeatedly that Dr. Wall "confesses" that "infant baptism cannot be found in scripture," and that "infant baptism cannot be maintained but by the traditions of the Church."[a]

If Mr. Gale was deficient in modesty, Mr. Campbell's opinion of himself in comparison of others, is perhaps as immoderate. You remember that Mr. Walker exposed Mr. Campbell's report of his debate with him. This work Mr. Campbell reviews. I should like if I had room to copy the last paragraph. Suffice it to say that in the bitterness of his spleen he is not satisfied with heaping the most unqualified abuse upon Mr. Walker's book, but he undertakes to contrast it with his own transcendant performance which it exposed. He calls Mr. Walker's emphatically a *little* treatise, because it has a few pages less than his own, and an *ephemeral* production, as if his own would certainly live forever. After rating it as vulgar, malicious, false, inaccurate and ungrammatical, he adds, with great self-complacency, "It has, however, by the contrast of light and shade, of "good and evil, which every where appear in the natural and "moral world, been the happy means of furnishing a new evi-"dence of the excellency of truth and the corruption of error; "by giving to the volume which it attacks, an additional SPLEN-"DOUR."[b] That his volume was originally *splendid* is here taken for granted: Mr. Walker's answer is only allowed the honor of giving it *an additional splendour, by the contrast of light and shade!!* "Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips."

The Editor of the Pittsburgh Recorder, after travelling, published a journal of his tour. This Mr. Campbell notices in the most contemptuous manner; informing the public, that "the most astonishing and interesting incident recorded" in it, is, that the Editor became acquainted with an old Irish Lady who left one Presbyterian body to join another. Mr. Campbell also is an Editor; and in the same volume he gives us an account of his own tour to Kentucky. In this *splendid* performance he gives us more *astonishing and interesting incidents* in half a page than his neighbour Editor had given in three papers. He says, "I "have come home richly laden with intelligence derived from "observation, conversation with many of the most intelligent "and pious teachers of the Christian religion, and from reflexion "on religious men and things of our own times." He then modestly hints at his great superiority over those who only read geography by the fire-side; after which he speaks with rapture, of mountains and hills, plains and deserts, rivers and morasses, toils and perils, battles and gibbets, patience and perseverance,

---

[a] See Wall's Defence, pp. 132, 133.

[b] See his last spurious report, p. 418.

meadows and fields, fragrance and beauties, until the dull journal of the Pittsburgh Editor, appears fit for no other end than to give *additional splendour* to the Buffalo Editor's *volume, by the contrast of light and shade.*

You and I have the honor of knowing the weight of some of those most intelligent teachers to whom he refers, and we have participated in the amusement occasioned by the report of his interviews with them. You have seen, (in fancy, at least,) a man of education and information, and conscious strength, sitting in a circle of gazing, gaping, unlettered admirers, whom he calls bishops. He tells them that he was acquainted with a Scottish Laird; Bishop V. who sits by his side, moves his chair an inch back, as unworthy to sit in a straight line with such a man. He then observes that he was once in company with some of the Noblesse of France; Bishop V. recedes another inch. The great man farther informs them that he had conversed with members of the British Parliament; Bishop V. makes another move in the rear. To bring this "most astonishing and interesting" interview to a climax, the man of *splendour* then electrifies the company, by informing them that when ship-wrecked at a certain time, he was reading a Latin treatise on Logic! which, to men who know nothing of Latin or Logic, must have been as captivating as his declaration on the stage, that he had read all the works of Aristotle and Plato in the Original.

But Mr. Campbell denies that "his ruling passion is the love of fame." He does not wish you to think that he covets the admiration of fools. According to his own account he is one of the most modest, unassuming, self-denied, retiring men, that the world has known. Hear his own words in reply to Mr. Greatrake's charge of vanity. They are as follows, viz: "A person "that refused, as I have done, offers of connexion with popular "sects, and of places of public and conspicuous eminence in the "cities of Philadelphia and New-York, who could take his bible "and the plough, and sit down among the hills of Western Vir-"ginia, and from the age of 21 to 31, move in the quiet vale of "retirement without seeking in one instance to make himself "more conspicuous than his immediate duties and business re-"quired, affords, we conceive, but few evidences that his ruling "passion is the love of fame." To this Mr. Greatrake rejoins, "Give us proper testimony, aye, testimony, 'FOR THE BELIEF "OF THIS ONE FACT,' that you have had those overtures from "*popular sects*, and offers of places of *public and conspicuous* "*eminence*, &c., and when you do it, though not a miracle, it "will be a wonder of first rate magnitude."[a] This language of Mr. Greatrake is really provoking; and is calculated to drive his Antagonist to greater excesses of boasting. It would not be at all surprising if Mr. Campbell's next bulletin should announce to a wondering world, that he had rejected the offer of a peerage

[a] Miniature Portrait, p. 9.

in Scotland, and another in France; and that he had refused the offer of a seat in the British Parliament: preferring a retired life, with his hammock and his Latin Logic, ploughing the watery mountains of the Atlantic, in search of a sentimental shipwreck.

Mr. Campbell's literary vanity has made him give frequent hints in his book, that his reading is very extensive indeed. In page 366, he says, "We have searched all the large and vol- "uminous histories now extant, and many if not all the abbrevia- "ted ones, we have examined all the writings of those called the "Apostle's successors, both orthodox and heterodox." In the close of his book, he says, "Having explored all the systems of "infant baptism hitherto exhibited, I would inform the public "that unless some new ground is taken, I will promise to re- "view annually all the new works published on this question, "and sell the annual review for twelve and a half cents." Baptist controversialists can hardly ever forego the pleasure of appearing learned, even if they should, without credit, borrow all their materials from Pedobaptist writers. On a certain text Gale makes a pompous display of interpreters and versions, for both of which, Dr. Wall says, "One may plainly trace him along "Pool's Synopsis."[a] Mr. Gale, like my Opponent, affected a great familiarity with the Christian Fathers. In one of these exhibitions, he refers us to the Greek Original of Origen's Homilies on St. Luke. Dr. Wall had the trouble of informing him, that the work to which he referred was not now in the world![b] Mr. Campbell has fallen into precisely the same error with regard to the minutes of the Westminster Assembly. In his debate with Mr. Walker, he made some bold and untrue assertions concerning that venerable body, and nailed them by a reference to their written proceedings, in the following words, viz. "See "the minutes of the Assembly, met at Westminster, A. D. 16-43."[c] These minutes perished in the fire of London, A. D. 1666, so that Mr. Campbell tells us to see a work which has long been invisible.

If spared to publish my argument, I hope to shew one unhappy refuge of this gigantic polemic, which will be apt to expose the weakness of his cause to every scholar. It is his resorting to the critical principles of Horne Tooke, to defend exclusive immersion. I should be glad if every Baptist writer hereafter, would honestly own that their cause needs such a preposterous system to support it. I am inclined to think moreover, that inconsistency as well as extravagance, betrays either error or weakness or both. In one place he says, that Mr. M'Calla's "own letters "shew that he was competent." In another place, he says that Mr. M'Calla's speeches are "decisive evidence of his conscious "incompetency."[d] These he may appear to reconcile; but there are others which he cannot. While he was trying to secure the

[a] See his Defence, p. 168.
[b] Defence, p. 326.
[c] See a Note in p. 129.
[d] Debate, pp. 10, 336.

negative in the debate, he says, "In every controversy, then, "with the Pedobaptists, upon this topic, they affirm and we de- "ny, they commence and we respond."[a] His challenge was the ground of our debate. I had observed that the proposition which he there undertook to defend was an affirmative one. But he goes on to give arguments "which," says he, "according "to my views, will force the proposition into the form of a di- "rect negative in the discussion."[b] In other places he says, "Have I not taken an affirmative proposition?" "I was pledg- "ed to affirm and he to deny."[c] In another place he says that his opponent "necessarily affirms," and then calls upon him for the proof, because, as he expressly says, "the proof lies on the "affirmer."[d] He then goes on to compare infant baptism to a house made of ice, which he wisely tells us will soon melt away. He might have added that it was not more evanescent than that pitiable sophistry which conjured such a watery phantom against a permanent institution of Heaven.

After Mr. Campbell had accused me of holding a controversy in writing and not *viva voce*, I exhibited my notes to the audience, telling them how much space they occupied. This he has omitted to record! but he has, in page 82, recorded a similar exhibition of his own notes, which took place immediately after, and in consequence of mine! In connexion with this, he has partially recorded in the same paragraph a proposal which sets his controversial character in its true light. He urged that we should both give up our papers and books, and let the rest of the debate be a mere *logomachy:* or as he expresses it, "let our debate be *viva voce* as it was proposed." This is as much as to say that it could not be *viva voce*, if either party used papers or books, and that these were therefore excluded by our original plan: whereas "*it was proposed*," by himself, in his 8th rule, in No. 3, above, that "Whatever books are produced on the "occasion shall be equally accessible to the use of each dispu- "tant." He brought a great store of books to the debate with Mr. Walker, and in this same 82d page, gives the "stage of the "river" as a reason for not bringing some ponderous volumes to our debate; where, however, he secured by stipulation, the use of mine, many of which were brought for him by request. He even came to the stage with his own printed controversy in his hand, accompanied with a greater quantity of manuscript paper than I had. These lawful and honorable weapons he used as well as he could, and did not beg his Antagonist to throw away his sword,

> "Till at advantage ta'en, his brand
> Forced Roderick's weapon from his hand,
> And backwards borne upon the lee,
> Brought the proud Chieftain to his knee."

In Mr. Campbell's introductory address, he professes to be actuated by generous principles. He says, "I trust neither Mr.

---

[a]Debate pp. 10, 336.
[b]Debate p. 23.
[c]Debate pp. 142, 112.
[d]Debate, p. 55.

"M'Calla nor myself came hither for the purpose of displaying "our talents or our acquisitions. It was not, we assure you, my "friends, for the purpose of exhibiting our strength, or the "weakness of my opponent, that induced me to leave my family "and visit this place. No such inglorious object could have in- "duced me to undergo the privations and toils of my journey "hither." "No, my friends, it is not our own reputation, nor "sectarian victory we have in view; it is the triumph of truth, "it is the union of Christians on a proper basis." Did Mr. Campbell find after a few hours' discussion, that the truth would suffer, by his "few hundred references to the original scriptures "and a few extracts from ecclesiastical history, from authors "which I [Mr. Campbell] could not bring hither owing to the stage of the river?" No, he did not probably think that much evil would attend the reading of his texts, but he was willing to give them up, if he could by that means deprive me of mine; especially as he had many of his at his finger ends, and I could scarcely repeat five verses of the scriptures accurately, according to his account. He was willing also to give up his extracts from ecclesiastical history, because by writing and repeating them for years together, he could quote them by memory; whereas without notes, I should do great injustice to that evidence, which he knows is against him. As his proposal was almost if not quite in the form of a demand, I referred it to the Moderators. They decided that the parties had a right to use books and papers at discretion. After this I remarked that my Opponent's proposal reminded me of a similar one made in the sixteenth century. Martin Luther declared that in a debate between Eckius and Carolstadt, the latter had greatly the advantage, while the parties were allowed access to authorities in support of their positions; but after the proposal of the former to exclude all notes, papers and books was agreed to, the flippancy of the Pope's Legate, a practised disputant, produced a greater effect. For my own part, I observed, that as I did not undertake this discussion for the love of talking, or for the purpose of making empty assertions, but of defending the truth by good evidence, I should avail myself of such preparations and such authorities as were within my reach; leaving my Opponent to enjoy the same privilege, and to invalidate my proofs if he could. In Mr. Campbell's 88th page, he gives a new turn to this, evidently for the purpose of extracting a compliment to his superior abilities. There he makes me assert a historical falsehood, by representing Carolstadt as *rejecting* the proposal of Eckius, on account of the superior experience and flippancy of the latter; whereas notwithstanding these advantages, he accepted the proposal. He then makes me reject Mr. Campbell's proposal for the same reason; that is, because I dreaded his dexterity and volubility; whereas my reason was a wish to prove the truth, instead of waging a war of words. But of such errors as this, there is no end until you get to the end of his book.

One of Mr. Campbell's controversial arts was to multiply challenges indefinitely, and then to boast that every defiance entitled him to a triumph. In page 225, he has three of these and a reference to many more in the compass of a dozen lines. His manner was to speak with great confidence of every point, and to offer to rest the whole controversy on it. "Let Mr. M'Calla" says he, "meet us on this passage, as we have proposed to meet him on "many others; we will rest the whole controversy on this point. I "request my opponent to try it. I will rest the whole weight of the "controversy upon the correctness of the statement I have made, "upon the exposition of the allegory I have given." "I will pledge "MY ERUDITION, MY CRITICAL ACUMEN, MY RESPECTABILITY AS "A SCHOLAR, that he cannot, upon the investigation of that refer- "ence—Nay I will rest the whole controversy upon it. If he "proves this one point we shall say all is proved, and his cause is "triumphant."[a] He knew that our meeting was occasioned by his publishing and my accepting a particular challenge, which was then, by written agreement, the subject of discussion. He knew also that this challenge embraced several important topics, which must be supported or oppugned by many scriptural authorities. Notwithstanding this, he would sometimes perch upon some outer twig of some inferior branch of one of these topics, and fiercely challenge me to let the whole controversy turn upon that point. Nay he would sometimes select some single passage of scripture adduced on that remote point, and challenge me to make that the subject of discussion, to the exclusion of all other topics, arguments and authorities. In page 124, he says, "Let "him then lay aside every other topic and open this chapter." Seeing that his original challenge suffered much by rough handling, he often endeavoured to draw me from the work of destruction, by challenging me to meet him a hundred miles off about some minor matter not effecting the main topics; as a partridge makes a great fluttering on one side of the road to decoy the traveller from her nest which is on the other side. In page 218, after requiring me to rest the whole controversy on one point, he expressly tells us that whatsoever might be the issue, "it would "not affect the main topics of discussion!" Yet because I kept up a steady fire upon his original positions, and paid no attention to his decoys and distant alarm guns, he bravely accuses me of unmanly and cowardly conduct. In his recapitulation, page 388, he says "You will also remember that in every instance "when I invited Mr. M'Calla to the discussion of any particu- "lar portion of scripture, pledging myself to rest the whole con- "troversy upon it, such as," &c. &c. "he manfully declined "and resolutely refused to do so" A stranger would hardly suppose, that before these words were written or spoken, I had, as far as the time would allow, noticed particularly and successfully almost every important argument and text adduced by Mr. Campbell or any other baptist author. It is probable that two exceptions could not be produced, although my time was so limited. Yet as he is judge and jury, accuser and witness, he seldom gives

[a] See Debate, pp. 218, 250, 124.

me credit for so doing: and when, for a rarity, he does admit it, he makes me as in page 261, rest the whole controversy on it, after his fashion; and because I merely contradicted this statement, without consuming time with useless explanations and disputations, he brings me in more guilty than if I had not noticed the point at all. Thus he wraps it up.

What Dr. Wall says of Mr. Gale's eloquence, may be said of Mr. Campbell's. "His talent in rhetoric, (which is not inconsiderable) he uses to false colouring and gaining his point (as he calls it) by wrested representations of things and passages."[b] He is a considerable wit. One effect of this was, that in proportion to his ambition to excite laughter, so was his mortification when the laugh was turned against himself. When he was prostrate, I endeavoured to lead the audience into a serious frame. This was done to spare his feelings and to promote the general edification. For this favour he rewards me by putting foolish words into my mouth, and by pretending as in the last page quoted above, that the risibility which I endeavoured to repress, was not at his expense, but was excited by "a canting tone and a sorrowful countenance" which he there indirectly attributes to me. But these very expressions are a great softening of the real words which he used in the debate. Instead of "a canting tone and a sorrowful countenance" as in the report, his real expressions were, "*long faces, dirty Pharisaical faces, sanctified sighs, pious sobs, and holy groans.*" His thus altering his own words, is a proof that his conscience and taste are not yet perfectly insensible to the ugliness and the odiousness of vulgarity, profanity, and scurrility. That these expressions were the ebullition of spleen and mortification was as evident, as that he was afterward moved by his hatred against missions, to censure the London Society and the Editors of the New-York Observer for relating certain "transactions, without a comment and with out A GROAN."

What easy and astonishing success attended Mr. Campbell's labours in the debate, if we listen to his own account! One would suppose that he had nothing to do but to attend the funeral obsequies of his Antagonist. He tells the audience that "Mr. M'Calla, theologically considered, is digging his own grave. "He is, in fact, about to defeat his own cause, and to subvert his "own theses." "He has not only killed, but buried himself." "He was digging a pit for his own interment." "We have "seen he is theologically dead and buried." "But recollect "my friends, he has not made one struggle to get out of the pit "into which he has fallen. He is buried under the ruins of one "of his bulwarks."[c] Mr. Campbell is not satisfied with the death and burial of an individual, but every "hireling priest,"

[b] See Defence, p. 47.

[c] See Debate, p. p. 133, 134, 194, 195, 203.

(as he politely calls Dr. Mason and his adherents, in page 207,) is consigned to the tomb with me; and in page 293, he pronounces over us a pompous funeral oration, in which, with his usual regard to truth, he says, that his Antagonist "has examined "the annals of the world for fifteen hundred years, and has not "found a syllable about infant baptism!" But this is only one out of fifteen hundred such statements, several of which you inform me he has published against you.

Your letter moreover says, "unless you soon publish your de-"bate with Campbell, his friends in this country will say that "you are conquered." This is a temporary disadvantage to which I desire patiently to submit; especially as it is firmly believed that the truths which I advocate, have, by Divne assistance, obtained a real victory, and shall, by the same assistance, secure a permanent triumph. The hasty, crude, partial and spurious publications of my Baptist and Universalist Antagonists were designed, in a great measure, to make money: and if I were such a hireling as they are, I should have adopted their measures. They are calculated to give a momentary lift to their cause, but ultimately to destroy it. When the public has fully and fairly heard both parties, may we not hope that the truth will triumph in the press, as it did on the stage. When they compare my work with Mr. Campbell's I am not afraid of their decision on the merits of the cause, or on the weight of argument. His unanswered publication gives a partial and momentary turn to the popular voice: but if he had remained silent like myself, or if my argument could have been published with his, this effect would not have been known.

It is natural that the parties and their friends should be alive to the immediate effects produced upon the community by their oral controversy. Each is willing to think that the public voice assigns to him the palm of victory. This is a subject which admits of something more tangible than declamation. Mr. Campbell himself concedes that an unaccountable anxiety to bring a debate to a close, is an evidence that the party, thus solicitous, feels that he is losing ground. For this reason he represents Mr. Walker as requesting his Moderator to curtail the debate of the last day.[a] The Moderator afterward published a denial of the fact, and very correctly observed that, "the statement is obvi-"ously intended to bias the public with the apprehension that "Mr. Walker was exhausted or tired with his part of the con-"troversy."[b] In my case, it is quite unnecessary to manufacture instances in which my Opponent "was exhausted or tired with his part of the controversy." As he came to the ground determined to conquer in three hours, or a day at most, he soon became impatient of delay. Accordingly, on the second day he proclaimed himself victor, and pronounced the debate at an end.

---

[a] See Debate with Mr. W. p. 121.

[b] See Mr. Walker's Reply, p. 242.

Finding me still under weigh, he appealed to the bench to enforce his proclamation, by controlling my course. Being disappointed here also, he plead sickness as a reason for a premature adjournment. *His* Moderator backed this request by a mournful complaint that his seat had been very hard to him that day. Although the sympathy between the Moderator's seat and his champion's stomach was invisible, yet it was not inexplicable to a part of the audience, to whom it occasioned no little merriment. It was at this time that Col. Morris proposed to me the question about the gesture of an exhausted race-horse. If I had complained, it would have been nothing unreasonable, because I was really sick, and was getting worse every day; whereas, in his preface, he asserts "the improvement of" his "health during the seven days of the discussion." Notwithstanding this, he manifested to the close, as great a solicitude to terminate the discussion as I did to continue it. Here then you have an instance of a man who is daily improving in health, and yet using every art to escape from the grasp of another, who resolutely maintains his hold, though daily declining in health. His appearing on the last day, an hour too late, and then carefully assuring the public that he had come according to adjournment, indicates an exhaustion which he would conceal at the expense of truth. Late as it was when he came, he insisted that we should read our voluminous correspondence, which a few days before, he had refused to read, when I requested it as a means of exposing his false statements concerning it.

The opposition of Mr. Walker's Moderator to the reading of Robinson was construed into evidence of fear and defeat: Yet Mr. Campbell's Moderator opposed the reading of the same book by me, because I turned it against him. Mr. Walker's sneer at Mr. Campbell's load of books was construed into a "PANIC;" and although Mr. Campbell declared his intention of bringing many of them to our debate, and actually did appear with pompous preparations in manuscript and in print, yet he himself was at last reduced to the necessity of sneering at my notes and books, and of making a formal proposal that we should give them up: and when he failed in this, every shot from the Pedobaptist battery marked its effect by the groans and complaints which it elicited against the "LITTLE BOOK."

Except a few instances in which I stopped to chastise his irrelevant wit, (merely intended to annoy,) I endeavoured in every speech, to make all practicable progress in a regular chain of argument. When he had exhausted argument and sarcasm, he spent hours, if not days, in irrelative essays, intended to pervert such precious graces as faith, hope, and charity; and to prove that it is from ignorance and wickedness that people pray "thy kingdom come;" and to shew that people ought to be permitted to drive waggons and herds of hogs on the Sabbath day; and a variety of such matters equally connected with baptism. This son of Kish, this Gadarene; who loved cattle and hogs better

than obedience to the laws of God and man, uttered and repeated some of these loathsome essays on the last day; at which time he published another challenge accompanied with new restrictions, the necessity of which he said he had learned "*from experience!*" and lest we should not know where his experience was obtained, he expressly told the audience that these restrictions were intended to prevent intrusion from such men as myself! This is precisely the way in which my Universalist Antagonist secured himself from future danger. For men to talk and act thus, and yet boast of a victory, is preposterous indeed.

As an evidence of his final success, and of my defeat, he represents me as trying to obtain an assurance from the Moderators that he would not be permitted to reply to my last speech. If this were true, it would be proof of my conscious weakness, as our rules gave to each the right of speaking until satisfied. But if it be a fact, as the Moderators and audience know it is, that I did not endeavour to deprive him of this stipulated privilege, but that he endeavoured to deprive me of it, then the evidence of defeat is on the other side. Moreover, when the President announced his intention of remaining, if we chose, for three days longer, contrary to his former determination, and when I warmly expressed my gratitude for such kindness, such was Mr. Campbell's terror at the apprehension of protracting the debate, that he made one foolish sentence answer for his last speech.

Among those witnesses which Mr. Campbell cites for the correctness of his report, there is one class of persons, who, as far as I can learn, have no existence whatever, except on the 12th page of his preface. They are "those who were on the other "side [from him] when the debate commenced, but who were "convinced by hearing it, that infant sprinkling is a human tra-"dition." If you will examine the whole sentence, you will find reason to conclude that he never heard of such persons himself: for along with those witnesses whose testimony he professes to "know" will be in favour of his book, we find "every umpire that heard the discussion." Now you know very well that the testimony of two out of the three umpires is wanting to that end, and one of them has publicly condemned his book as an abominable imposture. A man who can indulge in such wild insinuations and eroneous assertions cannot be reasonable trusted. Although his spurious debate may have led many weak people astray, I do not believe that he has ever heard of one person who was proselyted to his cause by *hearing* the *real* debate. Yet I have heard things which would delight his heart if they were as much in his favour as they are in mine. One of the most eminent elders in the bounds of the Kentucky Synod, and a personal friend of yours, informed me in this house, that a discourse delivered in Washington, before the debate, by your humble servant, in answer to Mr. V.'s sermon on baptism, was the means in the hand of God, of convincing him that our baptism was Christian baptism: whereas Mr. V.'s misrepresentations, if un-

refuted would have taken him away. This is the discourse to which, during the debate, Mr. Campbell referred, as being delivered with so bad a spirit. On this subject also, you are acquainted with an interesting fact. You know that an intelligent man who was then and is yet, a Baptist from principle, did, immediately after the sermon was delivered, shew me unequivocal marks of affectionate regard, among which a present of twenty dollars was one.

On the question, who had the weight of argument in the debate? you will probably agree with me, that among friends and foes, there was, in general, but one opinion. A citizen of Augusta who was an enemy of mine rode in company with a citizen of Washington who was unfriendly to me. The Washingtonian answered all his enquiries concerning the debate, and told him that my deportment on that occasion had made him my friend. My stern Augusta neighbour came home and told his friends that he was glad that Campbell had been severe with M'Calla, for he deserved it; but he was nevertheless pleased that a man who had travelled so far to whip a Kentuckian, should go home with a good beating. Another citizen of Augusta (since removed) who inclined to the Baptist views, declared to me in a letter which is now before me that I gained a decided victory, and that the debate convinced him that Mr. Campbell was wrong. Another who had some dislike to me because his acquaintances were almost all Baptists and their adherents, visited Washington and Maysville shortly after the debate, and being asked on his return, what the people in those places said upon the subject, he had to answer candidly that they considered Mr. Campbell beaten, his occasioned Dr. K. to insult him before the company. A citizen of Ohio, near Augusta, declared that in his presence, very prejudiced members of rigid Baptist families near Washington confessed that I had the advantage. Another fact you are probably acquainted with. A niece of a Baptist preacher had for years advocated the Baptist cause. Her uncommon intelligence is the object of general admiration. In the debate she sided with Mr. Campbell, until the argument on household baptism convinced her. This she said was irresistable.

The impression which the debate made upon the temper of the parties speaks loudly on this subject. When the discussion closed, the countenances and behaviour of the parties presented a strong contrast. Happy good humour enlightened the one, and surly displeasure beclouded the other. In some cases the Baptists refused to shake hands with the other party. A few days afterward one of them told an elder of my Church that his champion had beaten me. "Well" answered the elder, "there "is one strange thing about that matter, that I should like to "hear you account for. It is this; you say that we are conquer-"ed; yet we bear it with great good humour: and you say that "you are the victors; yet you are all angry about it. I thought "that the conquerors were generally pleased, and the vanquish-

"ed enraged." Whether therefore we look at the conduct of Mr. Campbell or of his followers, during the discussion or after it, there is an air of dissatisfaction and disappointment which looks very unlike that ascendency which he claims. He was not satisfied with the subject of the debate, although it was his own challenge; but was always challenging me to discuss something else;———He was not satisfied with the time occupied in the debate, but was constantly trying to bring it to a close;———He was not satisfied with the regulations of the Bench, because they gave me as well as himself, the right of taking my own course;——— He was not satisfied with the use of books and notes, because, through divine help, they enabled me to lay before the audience a mass of irrefutable evidence, instead of irrelevant harangues, vain boastings, mournful complaints, and empty triumphs. Toward the close he became dissatisfied not only with the subject, but with the very form of his original challenge, because, like my Universalist neighbour, he had learned from experience, that it was wiser to guard against the intrusion of such a person as he was then contending with. While his people participated in his discontented and angry feelings, the Pedobaptists and myself became quite in a good humour, with every thing. We were even pleased with the challenge, at last, notwithstanding "its confusion of points and vulgarity of expression." We were pleased with the time occupied, and would rather have wished it longer than shorter. We were pleased with the decisions of the bench, because they were fair, equal and honorable. We were pleased with the use of notes and books, because, through divine goodness, evidence, without declamation, gave triumph to the truth. We were even pleased with our Antagonist, because as far as our knowledge extends, he is the most powerful champion of Anabaptism in America, if not in the world.

I still remember with delight, my dear brother the many happy hours which we have spent in sitting and riding, preaching and praying together. I still remember your tender attention to me in sickness. May that love which has been formed on earth be continued in heaven. Remember me affectionately to your little Theological Seminary[a] and their pious mother.

Yours in Christ,

W. L. M'CALLA.

Philadelphia, Nov. 1, 1826.

No. 19.

New Report of a Debate on Baptism.

The following report is intended to embody a syllabus of my whole argument on Baptism, in connexion with such of Mr. Campbell's matter as it was right that I should publish, and yet

---

a Two of his sons are called Archibald Alexander and Samuel Miller.

such as, in many cases I could not put any where else. It is also intended to shew how much better it is for each to publish for himself, than one for both. It is not given as an exact report of my conference with Mr. Campbell, though it might claim this character more justly than Mr. Campbell's book. As it professes, like his work, to be written by the Baptist controversialist, the names of the parties and of the author shall be fictitious, and shall be taken from their denominations. As my argument consisted of seven topics and we occupied seven days, I shall make the topics and the days to coincide. I shall not pretend to give the real number of our speeches, nor shall those which are noticed be given in their exact order. Like Mr. Campbell I shall take the liberty of giving as many sums, specimens, abstracts and miniatures as convenience may require, without adhering strictly in all such cases to the exact sentiments. Like him also I shall make some transpositions and suppressions. But I shall not like him, forge for my antagonist my own peculiarities, nor help him out with supplements and interpolations. I shall not publish in his name, extracts from authors which he never saw, nor give him words and sentiments which he never uttered. In his speeches I shall give his own words as they are found in his book, once in the preface, twice or three times in the correspondence, and the rest in the debate. I proceed to give, first, the title page, then the dedication, and lastly the debate.

TITLE PAGE.

A Debate on Baptism between an Anabaptist and a Pedobaptist, in consequence of a general challenge published by the former and accepted by the latter. "All the arguments on both "sides shall be faithfully and impartially detailed, and all the "evidence adduced on the occasion, shewing on which side the "truth lies on this long contested subject, shall be as fully ex-"hibited as the nature of the case will permit."[a] The whole being snugly squeezed into a certain number of pages fixed upon in a printed Prospectus, circulated before the debate began, and while the Author expected that the discussion would occupy three hours instead of seven days. Written by the Anabaptist and attested by Sidney Sapscull. "I could make a boy of sixteen dispute with the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury." Campbell. "Caesar aut nihil." Greatrake for Campbell. Copy right secured, not for filthy lucre's sake, but from the most disinterested philanthropy. "After the present impression [of "6000 copies] is sold [for $6000] we will [Generously] give "the right of publication to any applicants, who may be disposed to republish in any distant part of the Union, for a very "small consideration:"[b] say $1000, as I am no hireling priest.

---

[a]Campbell's Prospectus printed and circulated before the Debate.
[b]Mr. Campbell's advertisement following his copy-right.

DEDICATION.

This work is not dedicated to my neighbours at whose expense I was brought to this country; because I have been abusing young beneficiaries and their benevolent supporters ever since. Nor is it dedicated to the Legislature of the State in which the debate occurred, because after my third sermon, (for I had three sermons that I preached almost every where, and the last of them was against preachers and sermons and all such things;)——After my third sermon, I say, the Legislature quit me, to follow Dr. B. who exposed me. I shall not therefore dedicate it to them, but the state in general, on account of the extreme salubrity of its air, which caused my health to increase during seven days of hard fighting, except on the 2nd day, when the refusal of the Moderators to handcuff my Antagonist made me considerably dyspeptic, and made the seat of Bishop Tricentiman uncomfortably hard, for which reasons there was a premature adjournment.

DEBATE.

FIRST DAY.

"Silence and good order universally pervading the large as-"sembly, I thus began: Men, Brethren, and Fathers;" After which entrè, I endeavoured, according to the directions of Cicero, to make the audience attentive, benevolent and docile, by persuading them that I was not the original challenger, and that I meant no harm to Pedobaptists, when I accused them of holding a human tradition which was supremely injurious to civil and religious society.

My Pedobaptist Antagonist, after a *long-faced* introduction of a few words, and in consequence of my determination to treat the subject historically as well as argumentatively or scripturally, distributed the matter of the challenge into seven topics. 1. The scriptural subject of Baptism. 2. The scriptural mode. 3. The history of the mode. 4. The history of the subject. 5. The history of Anabaptism. 6. The effects of the subject. 7. The effects of the mode. He then began upon the first topic, and undertook to prove that the scriptures authorized the baptism of infants, because they contained divine command and apostolical precedent for this duty.

"I then arose."[c] "Mr. Pedobaptist, theologically consider-"ed, is digging his own grave. He is, in fact, about to defeat "his own cause, and to subvert his own theses; for as soon as he "has proved the identity of the two societies, so soon will he "have destroyed his whole scheme. This we now assert, and we

[c] All these pompous introductions to his speeches are copied from Mr. Campbell's book.

"pledge ourselves to make it manifest as soon as he says he has "proved the point. The case will stand thus. If Mr. Pedo- "baptist does not prove the identity of the Jewish and Christian "Societies, this being fundamental in his scheme, he is on his "own principles, defeated. And I now assert and pledge my- "self to prove hereafter, that if he does prove their identity, he "has not only killed, but buried himself In either case his "cause is lost. On this ground it will be *proven* that the Pedo- "baptist cause is untenable."

My Pedobaptist Opponent then proved a divine command for infant baptism by arguing in five propositions as follows; viz. 1. Abraham and his seed were divinely constituted a visible church of God. 2. The Christian church is a branch of the Abrahamic church: or, in other words, the Jewish Society, before Christ, and the Christian Society, after Christ, are one and the same Church, in different dispensations. 3. Jewish circumcision, before Christ, and Christian baptism, after Christ, are one and the same seal in substance, though in different forms. 4. The administration of this seal to infants was once enjoined by divine authority; that is, God once commanded it. 5. The administration of this seal to infants has never since been prohibited by divine authority; that is, this command of God originally given in the Old Testament, is not repealed in the New Testament, but rather confirmed; therefore he concluded that this command was still in force. He then proceeded to establish his first proposition, that Abraham and his seed were divinely constituted a visible church of God. This he did by shewing that the Abrahamic Society had 1. The oracles of a visible church. 2. The ordinances. 3. The members. 4. The officers. 5. The constitution. 6. The express, inspired, and unequivocal name of a visible church.

"I then arose." "You will no doubt, my friends, be expect- "ing that I should now think about redeeming my pledge. I "confess the time has come, when it becomes my duty. What "was I to do? I think this was my promise: that so soon as "Mr. Pedobaptist had finished the second position, I would "show, that in proving it to be true, he would thereby confute "himself." "You will however, no doubt, consider, my friends, "that according to my promise, something more is due. For I "said if Mr. Pedobaptist proved the identity of the two chur- "ches he was confuted, on the plainest principles; and I also "said if he did not, he would be confuted on his own principles. "Upon the supposition, then, of his having proved his first po- "sition, we have seen he is theologically dead and buried. But "now I proceed to shew that he has not proved the identity of "the two churches—consequently on his own principles, con- "futed. Here I request you to watch me closely, as this is a "point of no little moment." "But recollect, my friends, he "has not made one struggle to get out of the pit into which he "has fallen. He is buried under the ruins of one of his bulwarks!

"Better try to get out of the present catastrophe than to add to "the mass of materials already too heavy to bear."

My Pedobaptist Opponent then endeavoured to establish his 2nd proposition, the ecclesiastical identity of the Jewish and Christian Societies This he did by shewing from scripture that they were the same in religion, names, and constitution or covenant. Under the head of *religion*, he specified theology, morality, worship, government and discipline. Under the head of *names*, he specified such as treasure, kingdom, nation, generation, priesthood, people, tree, vineyard, foundation, floor, house, commonwealth, man, brethren, bride, children. Under the head of *covenant*, he proved that the Abrahamic, and not the Sinaitic covenant was the common ecclesiastical constitution of the Jewish and Christian Societies.

"I then spoke." "I will pledge my erudition, my critical "acumen, my respectability as a scholar, that he cannot upon "the investigation of that reference—nay, I will rest the whole "controversy upon it. If he proves this one point, we shall say "all is proved, and his cause triumphant. The conditions are "assuredly most easy, and this brings us to a speedy issue." "Let Mr. Pedobaptist meet us on this passage, as we have pro- "posed to meet him on many others: we will rest the whole "controversy on this point. If he establishes his views by a "fair criticism on this passage, although it would not affect the "main topics of discussion, yet we would cheerfully say that he "had gained a victory." "I asked him to produce one testi- "mony of holy scripture, to shew that baptism was ever called "a seal of any covenant. Did he attempt it? No. I then pledg- "ed myself to rest the whole controversy, as far as I was con- "cerned in it, upon his proving from Rom. 4, 11, that circumci- "sion was to any, or every Jew, what it was to Abraham. Did "he meet me on this topic? No. And yet he goes on asserting "these points, as though he had proved every thing. And again "I gave him a similar challenge to discuss Col. 2, 11. 12. Has "he met on that point either? No, no. In no one instance, "from the commencement of this discussion, dare he encounter "me on any definite terms—he does best at a great distance. "He keeps off at sea, fearing to be land bound." "I will rest "the whole weight of the controversy upon the correctness of the "statement I have made, upon the exposition of the allegory I "have given." I closed this animated and terrific address, by asserting that Calvin and Beza were the first who had ever said that baptism had come in the room of circumcision.

The poltron of a Pedobaptist, without taking the least notice of one word that I had said, proceeded very coolly to establish his third proposition, the *sigillistical* identity of circumcision and baptism; by producing scripture for their use and signification, their duration, their subject, and their substance. On their use and signification he shewed that they were both initiatory seals,

that they were both signs of justification, and both signs and means of sanctification. On their duration he proved from Rom. 4, 11, that though circumcision, as to its original form, is now dead, yet it still lives in substance, in another form. On their subject, he proved from Phil. 3, 2, 3, that Christians were now the circumcision; that is, in a certain sense, circumcised. On their substance, he proved from Col. 2, 11, 12, that baptism was the circumcision of Christ, that is, the Christian circumcision. In opposition to my assertion that Calvin and Beza were the first that ever held the substantial identity of circumcision and baptism, he produced the express declarations of Athanasius, Epiphanius, Austin, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Basil, Cyprian, and Justin Martyr. He then answered objections to this doctrine.

"I then proceeded" with a dissertation on the petition "Thy kingdom come;" (which I have preached in Lexington and many other places,) shewing that to use such a prayer now, must proceed from ignorance or wickedness. None but those who have been in my situation can imagine how happily this sermon answered here, to take off the attention from those old superstitious Pedobaptist Fathers that had been quoted against me, to shew that Calvin and Beza were not the first to say that baptism had come in the room of circumcision, but that this doctrine can be traced up to the Apostles.

My Pedobaptist Opponent who was both ignorant and wicked, then established his fourth proposition, that there is a divine command for the administration of this seal to infants; and his fifth proposition, that this command has never yet been repealed, but rather confirmed; after which he drew his conclusion that it was still binding. He considered himself then as having made good his argument that there is now in force, a divine command for the baptism of infants. He then entered upon his argument from Apostolical practice. Here he displayed the doctrine of household baptism; shewing that *oikia* and *oikos* and *oikodomeo*, with their numerous conjugates, whether used in relation to the material or spiritual *house*, the ecclesiastical or celestial, the national or sectional, the royal or pontifical, the patriarchal or domestic *house*, will all confirm and illustrate the doctrine that a *household* embraces infants, and that the household baptism of the New Testament is infant baptism.

2nd DAY.

The Pedobaptist entered this day upon his second Topic, the scriptural mode of baptism, on which he took the following position, viz. *The scriptures do not make submersion essential to baptism:* after which he criticized the original word at considerable length.

"I replied" J. P. C. allows three minutes a-piece for hear-
"ing the experience and baptizing each of the candidates and,

"confining it to twelve persons, he calculates more than twelve "hours would be requisite. But he forgot that the Apostles "were not such dreamersand talkers about experience as some "of his contemporaries. Query. How long did it take the "eunuch to give in his experience?" "As to those puerilities "you have heard about John's baptizing with a squirt, or some "such thing in order to despatch the business, about the impossi- "bility of the three thousand being immersed in one piece of a "day; about Paul's standing up to be baptized; about the jai- "ler's not being able to find water sufficient for immersion, and "a number of other such boyisms, they are not half so feasible "as the arguments in favour of transubstantiation." "They "are all put out of countenance by adverting to the fact that one "person can immerse as many as another can sprinkle in a "given time. There are well attested facts of 60 persons being "immersed in 30 minutes, or in that proportion, when the bap- "tizer simply immersed those led into the pool or bath, or river "to him."

My Pedobaptist Opponent then descanted upon scriptural cases, scenes, and circumstances of water baptism: remarking that if he were to admit (which he did not) that baptizing where there were rivers and much water proved submersion, yet baptizing in the City of Jerusalem, in the jail at Philippi, and in the desert of Judea, would argue more strongly for sprinkling, pouring or washing;———if going down into and coming up out of the water, must prove submersion, (which he was far from admitting,) then *arising* and *washing* away ones sins in baptism, as in the case of Saul, must be something else than immersion;———if the going of the subject to the water must be a proof of submersion, (which he could not admit,) then the bringing of the water to the subject is a proof of sprinkling, pouring or washing;——— and if the baptism in the Jordan and Enon must prove that the subject was buried under the water, (which they did not,) the baptism in the cloud and in the sea is an undoubted case in which the numerous subjects were only sprinkled, while the Egyptians were immersed like the Gadarene swine and the Devils, the latter of which he broadly insinuated, (like Mr. Greatrake,) were my disciples, because they believed my "ONE FACT," and received adult immersion. He then examined certain Greek prepositions and the passages in which they occur, and commented more particularly upon those passages which evidently prove a partial administration of water in Christian baptism.

"I rejoined," by proposing to my Opponent that we should, during the remainder of the conference, dispense with all our papers and books, and made a speeeh to shew that this was the only way in which we could dispute *viva voce!* How evident is it that when notes or books are used in the Senate or at the bar, their contents are communicated, not VIVA VOCE, that is WITH THELIVING VOICE, but with dumb signs! Besides, the man who

(like Webster in Congress) uses such helps, gives plain proof of "*conscious incompetency.*" How different from the Hero, who can speak six hours at a stretch. with no other help than a gallon of porter and a volume of Burke, and can throw such a spell upon an enraptured audience, that when he is done, they cannot guess to what point of the compass he would direct their attention.

My Pedobaptist Opponent referred my proposal to the Bench, for their opinion. Although the President was himself a lawyer and a legislator, he seemed so grossly ignorant of Latin and the rules of order, as to suppose that a debate might be *viva voce*, although books and papers might be used. The Moderators therefore allowed the use of them, as consistent with our written agreement. After this my Opponent established his views of the scriptural mode of baptism, by scriptural allusions and comparisons, in which last he proved that Noah's Ark was not submersed, as had been asserted. He then closed with a recapitulation.

"In reply to which I spoke." "My friends this is the most "singular discussion I have either seen or read of. What is the "subject of controversy? What were your expectations in com- "ing hither? To hear a discussion upon church government, "discipline, doctrine? &c. &c. Is this the topic under discus- "sion? In this course of procedure there can be no debate. "Mr. Pedobaptist and I resemble two ships at sea; he sails in "latitude 40 north, and I in latitude 40 south, each bound for "his own port. We may pass each other in one latitude on our "voyage. We may then salute each other and proceed. Is "this the order of debates in schools, in deliberative bodies, on "any topic, in any country?" "Mr. Pedobaptist as he sup- "ports the affirmative necessarily opens the debate and the Ana- "baptist closes it." "In this controversy Baptists have noth- "ing to prove as respects their practice." "In every contro- "versy, then, with the Pedobaptists, upon this topic, they af- "firm and we deny, they commence and we respond." "Have "I not opened this debate, or have I not taken an affirmative "proposition? If Mr. Pedobaptist be my opponent, he is, I "presume, bound to respond to me. He is bound to proceed "according to the rules of respondents: If he be not my oppo- "nent, why did he engage to discuss this subject? Why did "he agree to take the negative side in this controversy? Be- "fore I proceed in waging this strange and unprecedented war- "fare in which my Antagonist will not attack me, nor defend "himself when attacked, but is fighting with some unseen An- "tagonist, and occasionally talking to me, I say, before I pro- "ceed farther in this course, I will appeal to the Moderators on "a question of order. Gentlemen, I know your powers in "moderating this controversy are very limited. This is not my "fault. I was willing to lodge all necessary power in your "hands. To this Mr. Pedobaptist would not agree. Yet still I "think you have the power of deciding whether we ought to

"proceed this way. One of those items in your hand, says that "you are '*to keep order*' in this discussion. The question then "is—is it order, in controversy, for the respondent to introduce "affirmative propositions, on any subject he pleases; and instead "of responding in the negative to his Opponent, to spend his "time in proving his own affirmations on other topics? This "question I respectfully submit to your decision." Thus ended my wind-broken appeal. "Bishop Tricentiman, after a number of remarks and references [to the Parliaments of Scotland and England, and the French Chamber of Deputies, with which he and myself are well acquainted] gave it as his conviction, 'that it was *out of order* for Mr. Pedobaptist to proceed in this way.'" And if the decision had been by weight instead of numbers, he would certainly have carried. "Bishop Tricenti-"man exhibits the finest appearance, tall and well propor-"tioned, weighing 300 lbs. of a remarkably florid and heal-"thy aspect, possessing uncommon energies of constitution, "and though on the borders of 50, says he feels no abatement "of his constitutional vigour." Although this description may rather overrate the symmetry of the Bishop's appearance, (an error which is often found in advertisements of stray horses,) yet I seriously think that he does not look so much like a hogs-head as some pretend. I will also readily admit that the bish-op does not weigh as much as some shew-beeves have done of late, yet he certainly out-weighs both the other Moderators. The Pedobaptist Moderator "Mr. Rod is rather below mediocrity in "his person, and his countenance does not indicate the most "healthy constitution." The same remark will apply to the President. Yet these two little sickly men, whose beauty none but Pedobaptists admire, overruled the most august dignitary of the house of Anak. "The Rev. Rod[a] replied to the Bishop that his opinion was different." The President then decided the point against me. How unmerciful to non-plus me in this way! I knew not what to say or do. I begged an adjournment, and gave sickness as a reason. The Bishop immediately took the hint. Notwithstanding his "remarkably florid and healthy aspect," he complained that his seat had been uncomfortably hard for some time; so as to occasion a slight "abatement of his constitutonal vigor," in despite of his "uncommon energies of constiution." We carried the motion for adjournment unanimo usly

THIRD DAY.

"I thus began." "It would be perhaps unbecoming and un-"necessary to say any thing about the talents or acquisitions of "my opponent. His own letters shew that he was competent, "and his speeches evince that his industry and research were "adequate to the task proposed, if his cause had been tenable. "But it requires more than Herculean strength to bring some-"thing out of nothing. Had Mr. Pedobaptist been on my side "and I on his, doubtless I would have been put to confusion; for

(a)See Mr. Campbell's Debate p. 142.

"I remember to have been vanquished by an old lady when I "argued up infant baptism against her. It is true I had some- "thing to say, and held on stoutly to the last; but I felt in my "own heart that I was defeated; and what mortified me no lit- "tle was, that with all my philosophy and divinity, an old wo- "man's common sense overpowered me." "What honor can "be gained from an encounter with a gentleman, a reputed lin- "guist too, who, like Mr. Pedobaptist and Mr. R., could bring "forward '*anastas*' in the case of Paul as a proof that he was "sprinkled? 'He arose' and was immersed."

My Pedobaptist Opponent here gave me Yankee treatment. He answered my last question by asking another. I had asked "What honor can be gained by encountering a gentleman" of such a character? He replied, What honor can be gained by encountering a man who is constantly uttering empty boasts of his "philosophy and divinity," his "erudition," his "critical acumen," his "respectability as a scholar," and who is nevertheless obliged to confess that "an old woman's common sense overpowered" him, and he was "vanquished by an old lady?" He then entered upon his third Topic, the history of the mode of Baptism, which he treated analytically, and not synthetically, which latter method has been followed by every one else. Here his fundamental proposition was, that the Christian Church has never esteemed submersion essential to baptism. He divided their testimony into three periods. 1. From the present time back to Wickliffe. 2. From him back to the fifth century. 3. From that date back to the Apostles. He then entered upon his first period, and examined the testimony of 1, America, 2, Asia, 3, Africa. After which his time expired.

"I then replied." "I have already submitted eight argu- "ments or evidences of the plainest character, all declarative "of an essential difference between the Jewish church and the "Christian Kingdom—Mark it well, my friends, Mr. Pedobap- "tist has not replied to one of them." "You will also remem- "ber that he has not so much as yet adverted to my disquisition "on the words in controversy." "You will also remember that "in every instance when I invited Mr. Pedobaptist to the dis- "cussion of any particular portion of scripture, pledging my- "self to rest the whole controversy upon it,', "he manfully de- "clined, and resolutely refused to do so." "It is well known "to you all, my friends, that these arguments have never been "attacked by my Opponent, and that they are directly subver- "sive of his whole theory." I then endeavoured to shew, in glowing colours, how unrighteous and oppressive the laws of the land are, in stopping men from driving waggons and herds of hogs on the Sabbath day. A Baptist minister present observed that he had been of that opinion for thirty years. It was even reported that Bishop Tricentiman had put these principles into practice, less than thirty years ago. "But I shall give place to "Mr. Pedobaptist to read farther."

The Pedobaptist then continued the consideration of his first period; and examined the testimony of 4. Europe. Among whom, as there was great diversity, he examined 1. Those who advocate exclusive immersion. 2. Those who only prefer immersion. 3. Those who practise a partial administration of water. On this point he quoted countries, churches, creeds, translators, commentators, lexicographers, and reformers, among whom Wickliffe's testimony was last examined.

"I thus replied." "Thus we have seen an end to infant "baptism. My Opponent has tried circumcision and the law, "the Abrahamic covenants; he has tried commands and prece- "dents of the Old and New Testament; he has tried 'prose- "lyte baptism,' and 'household baptism.' He has travelled "from Genesis to Revelation—He has gone from Jerusalem to "the uttermost parts of the earth—He has examined the annals "of the world for fifteen hundred years, and has not found a syl- "lable about infant baptism. Ill fated cause. It deserves to "be abandoned for ever. Amen. The *modus operandi* he has "at length introduced—*Mode* of baptism, curious phrase! Mode "of immersion is immersion itself, and mode of sprinkling is "sprinkling itself. Two modes of immersion and one of them "sprinkling is somewhat dissonant. Sprinkling a mode of im- "mersion, or immersion a mode of sprinkling is a new mode in "Logic. But we must bow with deference to established modes, "and it is vulgar to call it *action* its proper name."

"Mr. Pedobaptist resumed his notes," and examined the testimony of the church on the mode of Baptism, from the time of Wickliffe up to the fifth century; by 1. Their pictures, engravings, and monuments. 2. Their laws: after which he traced the third period, from the fifth century up to the Apostles.

FOURTH DAY.

"I commenced as usual." A dissertation on faith, hope and charity, consisting of a mixture of Paganism and Pelagianism occupied the time, toward the close of which I asserted, as I had frequently done before, that the voice of the Christian Church had always been in our favour, on the subject and the mode.

The Pedobaptist entered upon his 4th Topic, the history of the subject of baptism, which, like the third, was treated analytically. The proposition which he undertook to establish, was that the Christian Church has always practised infant Baptism. For convenience, he considered their evidence in six divisions. He examined their practice 1. From the present time back to the reformation in the 16th century. 2. The reformers who lived before that period. 3. The Waldenses. 4. Back to the fifth century. 5. The first four centuries. 6. Jewish proselyte Baptism.

"I then addressed the people." "Now we have not read "Rice's pamphleteer, but we have read some [all] of the writ- "ings of Aristotle and Plato in the original, and we have read "Dr. Samuel Rallston's 'condensed view' of the criticism, and "we boldly pronounce that it is 'a refuge of lies.'—And we "will go a little farther yet; and affirm, that not only is the "criticism erroneous; but that assertions are made in the 'con- "densed view' referred to, that are downright falsehoods. "Mark it well, my friends. We have said *falsehoods.*" "If "ever this discussion should meet the public eye, I am wofully "mistaken if his whole course in this controversy will not ap- "pear in the highest degree evasive. Assertion and evasion "are the two most prominent features in the polemical charac- "ter of Mr. Pedobaptist."

My Pedobaptist Antagonist then replied as follows, viz: "I "heard much of my Opponent's learning and talents before I "ever saw him; but never did I hear half so much in his praise "from any other quarter, as from his own lips. How does he "delight to inform us of his *erudition*, *philosophy* and *divinity!* "and lest we should not sufficiently prize his *critical acumen*, "and his *respectability as a scholar*, he must tell us, (whether "truly or not I dare not say,) that he has read all the works of "Aristotle and Plato in the original. What a contrast is there "between him and the ignorant raw Kentuckian who, without "being able to read one chapter in the Septuagint, or even to "repeat five verses of our translation, has ventured to meet "him! Rash mortal that I was, to encounter such a literary "Sea-serpent! But since it is too late to recede, I shall endea- "vour, with divine assistance, to finish the 4th Topic by an- "swering Baptist arguments in relation to it, and by taking "some notice of the works which are quoted in favour of the "Baptist cause." And here he gave such a mass of slander, as was perhaps never equalled since the flood. The consequence was that as this took place on Saturday evening, Bishop Tricentiman could not endure the burthen until the next Monday, but insisted strenuously upon continuing the debate through the Sabbath. He was overruled by the other two.

FIFTH DAY.

I began this day by insisting, as I had often done, that the Christian Church had always been in our favour. I traced the Baptists of the present day up to the Apostles, by a variety of channels: whereas all other churches were of late and low origin.

My Pedobaptist Opponent then entered upon his fifth Topic, the history of Anabaptism; in which he undertook to prove that the Baptists of England and America are descended from the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, and that they cannot be traced higher. He complained of having been compelled to in-

vestigate this subject, against his will. He examined the various channels through which Baptist writers profess to ascend to the primitive churches. 1. By the name of Baptists. 2. By their peculiarities. After which his time expired.

"I then addressed the assembly." "Having now replied to "every thing advanced by Mr. Pedobaptist from the commence- "ment of this discussion, bearing directly or indirectly a- "gainst our views; and having also advanced sundry arguments "both as respects the subject and action of baptism, which he has "not so much as ventured to impugn, I think I am entitled to "say, that I am not only, as respondent, got up with him, but "in the proof of the propositions which I was pledged to prove, "I have got considerably a-head of him in the natural stages of "this debate." "And you will have the goodness to bear in "mind that not one of them has been formally impugned by Mr. "Pedobaptist. We consider them, then, as far as respects him, "unanswerable."

My Opponent then examined 3. What historical evidence there is that the Baptists are descended from the Apostles. 1. Through the English Aborigines, to whom it is said that the Apostles preached. 2. Through the Waldenses, whom he had before proved to be Pedobaptists.

"I then addressed the congregation." "Having now paid "much more respect to his arguments than he has done to mine. "I will, my friends, for the sake of occupying a few minutes "advantageously, deliver you a short address on an important "fact." "I complained in my last address, that Mr. Pedobap- "tist read his arguments from his manuscript, and neglected to "respond to mine; which he is bound to do, according to all "established usage; or else to yield the point at issue." "Mr. "Pedobaptist still goes on to prove a point that I have not "denied. He is determined to take his own course; whether "his arguments are denied or affirmed."

My Opponent then examined other channels through which various Baptist writers endeavour to trace themselves to the Apostles. 3. Through heretical societies; to which he observed we were welcome, although historical evidence was wanting, for their being either christians or Baptists. 4. Many Baptists acknowledge their connexion with Munzer, and this can be proved, whether they admit it or not. 5. The inscrutability of their history, prior to Munzer, as acknowledged and urged by the Baptists themselves, is evidence that they cannot be traced to the Apostles.

"I then addressed the assembly." "Mr. Pedobaptist has "proved by the method he has taken, that he was con- "scious in his own breast, that he could not maintain his views "of baptism in a fair discussion. My reason for so alledg-

"ing is taken from the fact, that he wrote down at home all that "he has advanced as argument in this discussion ; and knowing "that he had all he could or would say in writing, he at the same "time, insisted that I should open the debate, whereas he was "determined to keep to his notes, let me take what course I "might. This then, I conceive to be decisive evidence of his "conscious incompetency. His marked out course required, "in the nature of things, that he should open and I respond— "but he wished to have the place of the respondent, and at the "same time to introduce the matter to be discussed. This was "good policy, but bad logic." Here I could not help complaining again of the refusal of the bench to control the movements of my unmerciful Opponent. The President called me to order; and observed that these insinuations were painful, and it was time to declare their inconsistency with decorum. I then eased my heart by complaining of the intolerable length of time consumed in a discussion, which I had thought could not occupy more than a day or two at the farthest. But lest the people should suppose that such whining arose from "conscious incompetency," I engaged largely in the challenging, trade. I challenged my Opponent to meet me on this point, and I challenged him to meet me on that text, and at last I challenged him to read chapter about with me in the Septuagint: after which I published another general challenge, with such new conditions as effectually to secure me hereafter from the intrusion of such plodding polemics as my imperturbable Opponent, who had taught me by experience that challenging was much easier than fighting. My new challenge therefore required that my next Presbyterian Antagonist should be a President of a college, or should be appointed by a Presbytery or Synod; and that if he were an Episcopalian, he should be a Dignitary of the Church ; for who else is fit to meet so dignified a personage as I myself? Feeling myself now pretty well entrenched against a future assault, and being at a loss for something to say, I began to sneer at the books which my Opponent had brought with him. But fearing that the people would think me no book-man, I observed, "It is true, I had about 150 volumes, which I would have brought with me, but for the stage of the river: But if I had brought them, I should have been far from using them as my Opponent has done. I should only have kept them as vouchers."[c]

My Pedobaptist Opponent then spoke as follows, viz. "The "audience were probably aware that with my last address, my "argument on the history of Anabaptism was closed. A short "appendix to that history is all that is now intended. Authentic records have perpetuated the remembrance of the Rustic "war, and the feats of Munzer the author of that sanguinary "conflict: but the mental exercises of that artful but incompe-

[c]These words, or words to the same amount were used in the discussion; but only a part of them are in Mr. C's Report.

"tent chieftain have been in a great measure buried in oblivion. "It is my intention to supply this defect as well as may be, by "a careful attention to the interesting exercises of a legitimate "descendant of Munzer, in similar circumstances of affliction "and dismay. When Munzer was breathing out his anathemas "and challenges to the Pedobaptist world, he was doubtless bol- "stered up with the thought that he was the Grand Patriarch of "the Anabaptist Religionists, and Captain General of the Rus- "tic Warriors. When the Rubicon was past, and he was "hemmed in by an army, and the awful realities of the tug of "war stared him full in the face, it is natural that his self-confi- "dence should give place to agitations of soul with which it is "highly desirable that his descendants should be acquainted. "As far as my means of information go, these struggles of his "illustrious bosom were probably expressed in something like "the following soliloquy. ——— 'With what an Emperor is 'Germany cursed! How little does he know of the Modera- 'tor's office, or the rules of order! I told him long ago, that 'as I began the conflict, and thus took the affirmative, my ene- 'mies were bound to *respond* to my directions, in their choice of 'weapons and measures. Had he compelled them to follow this 'plan, which is dictated by common sense and immemorial us- 'age, I should have soon tied them and him hand and foot, and 'given them over to the tender mercies of my undisciplined 'troops. For the want of this wise measure, our struggle has 'been protracted to a most immoderate length. I told my men 'that it should not last more than three hours, or a day at most: 'but here we have been on the rack for many days, and can see 'no end to the affair yet, unless, Alas! it shall soon end in our 'utter discomfiture. I expected to have written home before 'this time, in the language of the victorious Cæsar, "VENI, VI- 'DI, VICI, *I came, I saw, I conquered:*" but I have fearful fore- 'bodings, that my Anabaptist father, who helped me in a former 'combat, and whose help I greatly need now, will have to look 'out at the window, like the mother of Sisera, and cry through 'the lattice, "Why is his chariot so long in coming? why tar- 'ry the wheels of his chariot?" I am the more apprehensive 'of this fearful issue, from having again examined the ground 'upon which our decisive battle must now be fought. It is true 'that this is the very spot on which I challenged them to meet 'me; but then it was with the expectation that our Imperial 'Moderator was well enough acquainted with the rules of or- 'der, to compel them to take such a course as I should dictate. 'and not permit them to take their own course as they are now 'doing. Here we are like kids surrounded by wolves, and 'with nothing but a pervious breastwork of baggage waggons 'to protect us from their unbridled fury. But I am determined 'what to do. I will challenge some Dignitary of the Church, 'or some President of a College to meet me single handed; and 'in order to escape from my present ticklish situation into 'which my original challenge brought me, I will challenge him 'to meet me in Enon, or the River Jordan, or the Red sea, my

'own element, or if he would prefer it, I will challenge him to 'meet me on Mount Ararat, and there to read chapter about 'with me in the Septuagint, and to chime or chaunt the Origi- 'nal of Peter's First Epistle, [to the tune of Dr. McKnight,] 'from which I will undertake to shew by three incontrovertible 'proofs, that Noah's Ark was actually submersed in the waters 'of the flood, as a figure of baptism; and that after this, it arose 'to the top of the water and settled on Mount Ararat, the place 'of our meeting. If they will not agree to let me out of their 'hands, upon the ground of any one of my numerous defiances, 'I shall publish them as cowards, and my people at least, will 'believe it. But what wheeled engines are those which I see 'them arranging and presenting against us? Behold what das- 'tardly weapons for men of honor and spirit to use! Nothing 'but "conscious incompetency" ever brought artillery into the 'field. It is true that I have a hundred and fifty pieces of ord- 'nance at home, which I should have brought to the scene of ac- 'tion, but for the low stage of the water; but if I had brought 'them, can any one suppose that I would be so destitute of cour- 'age and politeness, as to use them, and thus raise a smell and 'a smoke that would be enough to take away the men's appetites 'for their dinner?'——While speaking thus, little did Mun- "zer know how many of his men had eaten their last dinner. "The stomachs and olfactories of their enemies were not too "delicate to burn powder. They opened a fire upon them "which soon riddled their frail fortification of baggage waggons, "and made the beef and the bacon, the bread and the blankets "fly about their ears, until Munzer and fifty thousand of his fol- "lowers lay weltering in their blood. But stop; did I say that "Munzer was killed? No, the unhappy man escaped the gen- "eral slaughter, and took care to hide himself where no Presi- "dent of a College or Dignitary of the Church could easily "find him."[c] [During this address and some others, the audi- ence laughed at my expense.]

SIXTH DAY.

"I arose." "Mr. Pedobaptist, conscious of his own incom- "petency to make a single criticism, or to defend one of his "own, shrewdly considered if he could work upon *my modesty!* "[lovely virtue!] so as to make me ashamed to even mention a "Greek word, he would then escape exposure, for I am told he "has affected to be a very profound linguist even in this very "place, and on a certain occasion defamed the illiterate Bap- "tists. But the fact is this, Mr. Pedobaptist is unacquainted "with Greek, and I now say he cannot, in my opinion, read one "chapter in the septuagint, if his life depended on it. Here it "lies before me, and he can easily have an opportunity of con- "vincing both you and me that I am mistaken." "I verily be-

(c) This is a tolerably exact report of what was said on the 5th topic in Washington.

"lieve that he cannot repeat five verses of the Old or New Tes-
"tament by memory."(d) "It will be necessary here to observe
"that during the course of this day some arguments were offer-
"ed by myself in proof of the proposition, 'that infant sprink-
"ling is injurious to the well being of society, religious and po-
"litical." One of the audience gave a very correct miniature of my arguments on this topic, by observing that I had charged Pedobaptism with the guilt of every sin that had ever been committed by our race, except one, and that was the first sin of Adam. I could inform him that this was omitted merely through inadvertency.

During the several speeches of my Pedobaptist Opponent on this day, he was not satisfied with noticing my accusations only, but he answered those of Robinson and other writers also. He shewed that Pedobaptism had been accused of *pride, superstition* and *innovation;* of *will-worship* and *ignorance; latitudinarianism* and *schism;* of *deceit, indecency* and *debauchery; stubbornness, Popery* and *Judaism;* of *blasphemy* and *rebellion; robbery* and *assassination; usurpation, tyranny* and *persecution.* In considering these heads distinctly, he sometimes appeared to turn the tables upon his Accusers. The audience gave visible, and sometimes audible evidence that they thought Robinson and myself guilty of bearing false witness against our neighbour. But what vexed me most of all was, that while they were entertained at my expense, my Opponent, with Puritanical gravity, endeavoured to reduce them to a charitable, serious and devout frame of mind. But I gave it an ingenious turn for all.

"I replied." "If Mr. Pedobaptist subjects himself to your
"smiles and provokes your risibility, I cannot see why he should
"blame you; nor do I see any propriety in his exhorting you to
"assume a sanctified appearance, and a prayerful countenance,
"while he manages this discussion in this singular way. We
"know there is a canting tone and a sorrowful countenance
"much practised by those who are most ignorant of the genius
"of Christianity. We do not plead the cause of levity nor of
"laughter, but we knew that there was nothing more obnoxious,
"to the reproof of Him, who was most certainly the most de-
"vout, than the whining sorrowful tone, and the sanctified ex-
"terior of those devotees, once called Pharisees, but which is
"now greatly extolled by many who inveigh against Pharisaism.
"A cheerful countenance and a pure conscience are necessari-
"ly allied, but a good conscience and sighs and groans, and a
"dejected prolonged face, [long faces, dirty Pharisaical faces,
"sanctified sighs, pious sobs and holy groans,] are very incom-
"patible and irreconcilable." [This speech stopped the laugh-
"ing.]

(d) This last sentence is taken from Mr. Lowry's notes. Mr. Campbell's report of it in a note, p. 335, is incorrect.

"Met according to adjournment;" that is, after I had come an hour too late!

My Pedobaptist Opponent remarked that the challenge charged the evils enumerated in the foregoing Topic (the 6th) upon "infant sprinkling." He had shewn that Pedobaptism was not justly chargeable with those evils in relation to the subject: and he would now endeavour, in discussing the 7th Topic, to shew that their baptism is not injurious to society, in respect of the mode, sprinkling, pouring or washing. He observed that *aspersion*, *affusion*, *ablution* and *immersion* were technical terms in medicine as well as in divinity; that they were allowed to differ very much from each other in their effects upon the human body, and that they were esteemed safe or not, according to the present state of the patient, and his constitution and habits. He asked the question, "Is submersion good for all diseases, all constitutions, educations and habits? Let any Physician answer." He said that many Baptists denied that any person was ever injured by receiving the ordinance in their mode: yet the same persons would allow that the administrators might suffer in health; of which he had known an instance, in a robust minister who was prevented from preaching in the evening by going into the water to baptize in the afternoon.

"I then arose:" but I could hardly arise, I was so full of the witty reply which I was going to make. That I had reason for gigling as I did, no person who has heard or read my speech can deny. "I observed, that Benjamin Franklin, when Minister "in Paris, dined with a number of French and American "gentlemen. A learned French Abbe at dinner entertained the company with a very learned disquisition on the deteriorating influence of the American climate on the bodies of all animals. That the human body diminished in size and "energy, and that even the mind itself shared in the general "deterioration. Dr. Franklin made no reply; but after dinner "told the company with what pleasure he had heard the learned "disquisitions of the Philosopher: he moved that the company "be divided, observing that the fairest way of testing the correctness of the learned Abbe's theory, was to place all the Americans on one side the room, and the French on the other. The motion was carried: and behold a company of little "swarthy insignificant Frenchmen on the one side, and a row of "little giants on the other. Aye, says the Dr. see here is a "striking proof of the correctness of your theory!! Now let "us take the philosopher's way of testing the correctness of "the theory of my Opponet. There sits on the bench a Baptist "and a Pedobaptist teacher, both well advanced in years; the "former has, we are told, immersed more persons than any "other person of the same age in the state, or perhaps in the

"United States; the other from his venerable age, may be sup-
"posed to have sprinkled a great many infants. Now see the
"pernicious tendency of immersion on the Baptist, and the hap-
"py influence of sprinkling upon the Pedobaptists." Through-
out the whole discussion there was not so happy a hit as the above.
Its claims to the character of real wit have never yet, to my
knowledge, been disputed. A proof of this is, that my hearty
chuckling did not keep the audience from laughing. Bishop
Tricentiman was delighted, and even "the Rev. Rod" smiled
and made me a polite bow.

My Pedobaptist Opponent observed that the challenge accused
infant sprinkling of being injurious to society. "This" said he,
"embraced our practice, as to the subject and the mode, the
"baptism of infants, and baptism by sprinkling or any mode
"short of submersion. Our practice as to the subject was de-
"fended on yesterday, from twenty distinct and important
"criminations. Not one of them has been urged against our
"mode; nor have any new charges been made out against it,
"unless my Opponent's last speech may be considered as charg-
"ing it with injuring the health of the Administrator, as our
"Moderator is a sickly man, while he would make you believe
"that baptism by immersion in a river or creek promotes the
"health and growth of the Administrator, because the Baptist
"Moderator who has done much of this service, weighs 300 lbs.
"In regard of the self-complacency with which the compliment
"was uttered by my Opponent and received by his weighty
"friend, I would observe that Goliah's weight was worth less
"than David's sling, and that this stripling was preferred to
"Saul who was a head and shoulders above the people. Be-
"sides, it would be every whit as reasonable to attribute Saul's
"enormous size to his hiding among the stuff on a certain occa-
"sion, as to attribute the size of our weighty Moderator to his
"wading in the water. If this were true, and the common
"sense of the public could be made to believe it, the sick would
"become almost amphibious, and would let their nurses, apothe-
"caries and physicians seek another way of living. If it be
"true that dipping the fingers into water, for the purpose of
"baptizing infants, has ruined the health of our Pedobaptist
"Moderator, then our three hundred pounder must have careful-
"ly avoided the daily washing of his hands and face. To say
"that his standing in three-feet water a few hours every month
"has preserved him from the effects of ordinary partial ablution,
"would be as reasonable as to affirm that Alexander's rushing
"into the river Cydnus was the means of saving him from dying
"by the many sprinklings of water and blood to which he had
"been subject. It is a fact of historical record, and it is the be-
"lief of the Medical Faculty ancient and modern, that his go-
"ing into the water on that occasion was extremely near taking
"the life of that hardy warrior. Through the providence of
"God, he recovered: and so did the Baptist preacher mentioned

"in my former speech, recover from the violent cold caught by "going into the water on the Sabbath afternoon; and since his "recovery he is very tall and very fat as he was before he turned "Baptist. But this argues nothing for standing in waist-deep "water, an hour or two at a time, in summer and in winter. A "strong constitution may endure the frequent repetition of such "hardships, and yet become as fat as an ox, [looking at Bishop "Tricentiman] yet a delicate frame might sink under one such "experiment." When my Opponent, with his long Pharisaical face, looked at the Bishop, the people also looked and laughed, according to the license which I had given to this healthful exercise. I confess it would have pleased me better if they had laughed at some other time; not on my own account so much as that of the Bishop, who sate very uneasy, and seemed as if he would like to hide his carcase, with that of the Royal Benjamite, among the stuff. But he soon plucked up courage, and whispered a while in great haste, with the President. It is said that, instead, of making a polite bow as the other Moderator had done to me, he wished the Bench to rebuke the speaker: but the president persuaded him to be patient a little longer and the discussion would close. My Pedobaptist opponent then proceeded to shew that the most eminent advocates of submersion, were also advocates for sometimes warming the water, confessing that the health of the subject as well as the administrator might suffer in the usual way. He was himself acquainted with a case of sickness occasioned by being baptized in this way; his friends knew other similar cases. He had in his hand a paper published in the town where the debate occurred, stating a case of a woman who lately died in the water, in the hands of the Minister. He produced other well authenticated cases of death occasioned by imprudent submersions. As far as sickness and death were the effect of immersion, he thought our mode injurious to society; but he could not see any valid objection against sprinkling as injurious. After this he considered himself as acquitted from the accusations of the challenge in every point; and as I had renewed my challenge with such alterations as would forever secure me from another such troublesome affair, he took the liberty of publishing a similar challenge, for the sake of being in fashion. The conditions of it, he said, were two. 1. The man who encounters him must be unanimously chosen by an Association in the interior world, which Captain Symms proposes to visit. 2. The Moderator chosen by my opponent must be one imported from Holland, who has been dipping and dipping and dipping, until he shall weigh at least five hundred weight. With this, the speaker and the audience gave another look at Bishop Tricentiman, whose tallow was becoming very cheap; but as the other Moderators were not sensitive enough to notice every thing, and as I had introduced the subject of his corpulency to raise a laugh against "the Rev. Rod," which greatly delighted the Bishop, he had now to grin and bear when the laugh was turned against him. My opponent then gave a l-o-n-g recapitulation of

his seven topics, with all their branches and propositions, points and particulars.

"I rejoined." "I was pledged to affirm and he to deny. He not-
"withstanding affirms and leaves me without an opponent in strict
"propriety.-On his plan of managing this discussion, I could make
"a boy of sixteen dispute with the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
"I would tell him to collect as much matter as would require ma-
"ny days reading; and to have it rendered so familiar, that he could
"read it very fluently, looking off now and then, and making a few
"extempore remarks. I would charge him never formally to
"attempt to reply to his Lordship, but when his Lordship,
"had done speaking to go on and read another half hour, and if
"his Lordship should attack and discomfit his arguments, never
"to appear to feel it; never to attempt to defend his positions,
"but to pursue his notes: taking care, however, in the course
"of his reading, to say any thing that might occur to his mind
"as very pert: [like my story of Dr. Franklin and the French
"Abbe;] in the mean time never venturing to lose sight of his
"manuscript. In this way his Lordship might become wearied,
"[as my Lordship most assuredly is,] and might not be able to
"speak so many days as he could read; and if he should only
"succeed in continuing longer than his Opponent, the majority
"would think he had the best of the argument; at all events,
"all would say, if his Lordship should excel, he had his hands
"full, and had little to boast of." After this compliment to the judgment of the majority, (which I rightly apprehended would be against me,) I recapitulated my challenges and triumphs as given above, and gave some important hints, such as I thought suitable to close with. My Pedobaptist Opponent arose to reply. I objected to his right so to do. He referred it to the Bench. They decided in his favour. The President who had before intended to sit no longer than that evening, told the parties that he would sit until Saturday night, (three days longer,) if they required it. My Opponent, with an appalling ardour, observed that he would love him as long as he lived, for such a declaration. Knowing that he had abridged his matter very much, and fearing that I might be kept on the rack during the rest of the week, I let him speak again; after which,

"I then just observed." 'Mr Pedobaptist is the most per-
'verse mortal that I ever had any thing to do with.'

"So ended the Discussion."

Note. "As I conceive myself on clear ground with the Pe-
"dobaptist world, as having explored all the systems of infant
"baptism hitherto exhibited, I would inform the public, that,
"unless some new ground is taken, I will promise to review an-
"nually all the new works published on this question, and sell
"the annual review for 12½ Cents."

No. 20.

NOTICE.

It was the Author's original intention to publish these papers with the argument, when it should have been prepared for the press. The plan of making them a separate pamphlet to precede the argument was lately suggested by a friend. The latter work may yet be delayed many months. The materials are full, and very conveniently digested, in the brief: yet sickness and weakness and many engagements make the draft for the press go on very slowly. It shall be finished as soon as Providence will permit. May God expose imposture, and bless his people with truth and holines, for Christ's sake.

INDEX.

No.		Page
1.	The Challenge, by Mr. Campbell, - - - -	12
2.	The Challenge accepted by Mr. M'Calla, - - -	15
3—12.	The subsequent corresponce by the parties, -	17—36
13.	On facts and on the truth of Mr. Campbell's Report, - -	40
14.	On the truth and genuineness of Mr. Campbell's Report, -	48
15.	The Campbellisms, transpositions, supplements, interpolations, suppressions, and alterations of Mr. Campbell's Report; with some notice of Dr. James Fishback, a Pelagian Baptist, gone all the way to Boston to put down the Unitarians!! - -	57
16.	Mr. Campbell's religious character, by Mr. Greatrake, a pious Baptist preacher of his own neighbourhood, - - -	73
17.	The religious character of the parties, in which the *one cent* verdict is discussed, - - - - - -	101
18.	Mr. Campbell's literary and Polemical character, with a word upon the question who gained the victory in the debate? -	115
19.	New Report of a debate on Baptism, containing specimens of Mr. Campbell's eloquenee, and a syllabus of his Antagonist's argument, - - - - - - - -	129
20.	Notice of W. L. M'Calla's full argument, now in hands, to be published, (God willing) in a few months, - - -	150